

By Mr. ROBSTON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15613) granting an increase of pension to Woodard Hensley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 15614) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Eva Broderick for the hire of an automobile by agents of the Indian Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15615) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Blosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15616) granting six months' pay to H. M. Cawley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15617) to compensate H. M. Cawley for the loss and death of his son, Edward S. Cawley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 15618) for the relief of Thomas H. Dowd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 15619) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Glardon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 15620) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Alvira Coonen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8065. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Democratic Luncheon Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring and commending the Colorado River project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8066. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of citizens of Oneida County, N. Y., favoring enactment into law of House bill 11410; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8067. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, protesting against the appropriation of any funds from what is known as "Red River money" for the purpose of constructing a hospital, or for the maintenance of the Kiowa Indian Agency's operating expenses; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

8068. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Cumann Bhreandain, St. Brendan Society, Mary C. O'Connor, 10 Marlboro Street, Belmont, Mass., secretary, urging repeal of the so-called national origins in the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8069. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Illinois Valley Protective Association, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of the Smoot bill (S. 4689 and H. R. 14116), to provide for Federal loans for reclamation purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8070. Also, petition of Ed. S. Vail Butterine Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing the passage of the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958) to amend the definition of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8071. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring amendments to the laws, through which to clothe the courts with power adequately to punish all parties found guilty of the charge of theft and pilferage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8072. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Pennsylvania Society, Sons of the American Revolution, John L. Walker, president, favoring passage of House bill 10171, to exempt from taxation new national headquarters of National Society Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8073. Also, petition of Pennsylvania Society Sons of the American Revolution, opposing repeal of national origins clause of present immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8074. Also, papers to accompany the following bills: H. R. 15513, granting a pension to Susan Enos; H. R. 15514, granting a pension to Emma H. Woolsey; H. R. 15515, granting a pension to Victoria Davis; and H. R. 15516, granting a pension to Lillie M. Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, December 20, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Strong Son of God, Immortal Love, to whom all the ministries of life are sacraments of beauty, we thank Thee for the gladness of the morning which calls to holy dedication and the

gentle peace of evening which speaks of quiet rest. Help us to a deeper knowledge of the world within, the glorious kingdom of the mind, the deep recesses of the soul, where we can hear Thy voice, comforting our sadness, banishing our care, urging us beyond ourselves to battle for the right. Free us from all pride and fear, from vulgar ambition and ignoble self-indulgence, that our desires may meet and answer to Thine own. Make us brave enough to bear the truth, strong enough to live in the light, and glad to yield ourselves to Thee, our Savior and our Friend. Amen.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States. The joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 12, to strike out the word "section" and insert the word "resolution."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, nothing has been done with the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is in order before the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that can not be the case. Nothing can be done before the Journal is disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent agreement sets aside all rules of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not care to discuss the matter with the Vice President, but Rule III specifically provides that—

The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that the joint resolution shall be the first order of business this morning. Without objection, the reading of the Journal will be dispensed with and the Journal will be approved.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) reported yesterday from the Committee on Agriculture with an amendment, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1929, to make advances or loans to farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of the southeastern United States where he shall find that an emergency for such assistance exists for the purchase of seed of cotton, corn, legumes, and vegetable crops, feed for work stock, and fertilizer, and, when necessary, to procure such seed, feed, and fertilizers and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed and fertilizer thus obtained by him for crop production. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed and fertilizer obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed the sum of \$3,000. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment of the committee was to strike out, on page 2, line 12, the word "section" and insert the word "resolution," so as to make the sentence read:

For carrying out the purposes of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000, to be immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senate is familiar with what occurred when the Porto Rican relief measure was here on both occasions; first, when it was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], and again when it was called up for consideration and finally passed. I endeavored on both occasions to make my position clear. The agreement that was reached was that the matter now covered by the pending joint resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This was done.

Yesterday morning we had a meeting of that committee. Representatives of the districts, including all the States that were so seriously damaged, were present. They confirmed what I had already outlined before the Senate. The condition that

exists in the States that were named specifically—Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina—was fully explained to the committee. After full hearing of the testimony given by parties representing those States the committee members present voted unanimously to report the joint resolution favorably.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail as to the condition that exists. I tried to do so fully when the matter was before the Senate heretofore. The Senate did not hesitate, and I was glad to join with them in the relief, so far as possible, of the distressing conditions in Porto Rico. I said then, and I repeat now, that in extending aid to the distressed Porto Ricans it did not in any manner lessen our duty to relieve the distress of a greater area and hardly less in degree that exists in the States I have named. The precedent has already been established, and I for one think it is a proper precedent. The Government of the United States represents the concentrated force of all the American people expressed in our organized society, and it does seem to me that it is a happy expression of the desire of all the people to aid any part of them who may be distressed. I voted gladly and cheerfully for the Porto Rican relief measure, and as I said then and repeat now, I think fellow feeling makes us understand the situation more clearly—at least more forcefully—than those who are not in like circumstances can understand it.

Half of my State, so far as agriculture is concerned, was affected by the storm and is in a condition that makes it almost impossible for the people to carry on unless they shall receive relief. Not alone is this a private thing. There has been extended to those people the quasi hand of the Government in the form of our intermediate credit banks and other institutions furnishing, as we had hoped, financial aid in a form that would be more suitable and available to agriculture; but they are powerless in these circumstances under the law even to grant a modicum of relief.

Now that the committee has reported and in pursuance of the promise made and the understanding had, the measure is before the Senate and the issue now is whether or not there shall be extended in as good faith to the citizens of this immediate country, who have been affected as the Porto Ricans were affected, the same measure of relief that was granted Porto Rico.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have never been informed in anything like detail as to the nature of the injuries or the nature of the devastation created by the storm.

Mr. SMITH. I will state to the Senator that I made the explanation before the Senate day before yesterday and it was confirmed yesterday before the committee. For the first time in the history of our State, so far as any meteorological record has been kept, from about the 16th day of June until the 19th day of September we had a precipitation that approximated 50 inches. During the growing period of the crops we had unspeakable and unprecedented torrents of rain. That extended through parts of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina. The ground was sodden and the streams were full to overflowing, and then, as a culmination there came the Porto Rican or tropical hurricane which struck our section on the 19th of September. The crops, as I indicated, had been previously injured and devastated. The hurricane was accompanied by a wind which in our section reached a velocity of 90 miles an hour, according to the Government records, with a rainfall greater in the space of time in which it fell than any preceding torrent which had fallen, so that the rivers already at flood could not take care of the additional amount of water. Areas were covered to a depth of anywhere from 4 to 15 feet; farm lands and houses were submerged, livestock destroyed, corn and cotton crops ruined. The region stood in that condition for more than two weeks, so that when the water receded the entire area had practically been denuded of everything. That is now the condition.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the extent of territory in the condition which he has described?

Mr. SMITH. The devastated region extends from about the Savannah River on the southeast up nearly to Wilmington, N. C., covering almost one-half of the State from just below what we call the beginning of the coastal plain to the coast.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I should like to quote from the preliminary summary report of the Red Cross of September, 1928. It says:

In Florida the centers of greatest destruction were in the counties of Palm Beach, Broward, Okeechobee, Martin, and Hendry. More than 1,800 persons were believed to have been killed—

That number turned out to be an underestimate. I think the number of killed was over 2,000—

mostly by drowning, and approximately 1,800 people were injured; 31,615 homes and other buildings were destroyed or damaged and agriculture suffered heavily. The problem of unemployment, which often accompanies disasters, added to the seriousness of the situation. In the Lake Okeechobee area water covered a large section of rich agricultural land, due to the overflowing of the lake. This water remained on the land for weeks and to date is still retarding the progress of permanent reconstruction measures in many places. More than 18,000 families, or 60,000 individuals, were affected by property losses throughout the entire Florida hurricane area.

A million acres of land—mostly agricultural land—were seriously affected and the waters of the lake piled up by the storm were thrown over the lower rim and drowned a great many people.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina what is the estimate reported by the committee for the proposed relief? Is it the same as when the joint resolution was originally introduced?

Mr. SMITH. It is exactly the same. The terms were gone over in committee which collaborated with the officers of the department, and followed closely the precedent heretofore set.

Mr. President, this is the condition. I know of course that there will be many who will be skeptical but even in the case of the appropriation for feed which we made I am informed that approximately 80 per cent of the advances so made have already been returned, and I am confident that with this aid to the distressed people they will be able practically to return this amount in the course of time. We, however, must recognize that out of the abundance of those who are not afflicted should come aid to those who have been. I have letters here which I have not seen fit to put into the Record from substantial, trustworthy individuals to the effect that unless this aid shall be extended, and extended at once, more than 60 per cent of the inhabitants of this region who have heretofore been engaged in agriculture must find other employment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator whether any estimate has been made of the approximate damage in this area caused by the flood and storm?

Mr. SMITH. There was an approximate estimate made by the director of the agricultural extension service in my State, collaborating with members of the extension service in Washington, and the amount carried in this joint resolution is the result of their approximate estimate. It is proposed to afford relief to people in five States.

I wish to say that some question has been raised as to a provision for the purchase of fertilizer. Those Senators from the Western States who are in sympathy with this proposition, perhaps, may not realize that the application of fertilizer—artificial fertilization—is just as essential to the coastal plain from Maine to Florida as is irrigation to the land in the West. The land of the coastal plain is highly productive under an application of concentrated fertilizer but it is not productive, generally speaking, without such fertilizer. The greatest item of cost on our farms is the fertilizer bill. There is expended something like \$50,000,000, if I recall the amount correctly, spent each year in South Carolina for the purchase of fertilizer. Fertilizer is used perhaps more extensively in the region directly affected by this disaster than in any other portion of our State. Therefore, a provision for seed, unless accompanied by a provision whereby the land could be fertilized would be futile. When so fertilized, perhaps, this land is as productive per acre as is any land in the country.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The joint resolution is considerably broader than any similar measure we have heretofore adopted, is it not, in extending beyond the furnishing of seed and including several other items?

Mr. SMITH. No. We passed one such measure last year, which was lost during the filibuster here, though it had passed both Houses. The reason of this extension, as I was trying to explain, is: Heretofore the major portion of the relief asked was for seed alone, because those making application for relief did not need any fertilizer and the hay crops and the ordinary ani-

mal food crops had not been so totally destroyed as they were by this inundation of water lying on the land indefinitely in the region to which I refer.

It was practically a wiping out of all of the resources of the ordinary farmer because of the water and the effect of the wind. Some of us personally saw the conditions. In what ordinarily would be called upland, in our parlance, rivers rising in the mountains of our State, and all of them emptying into certain channels, overflowed to such an extent that the farmers were out in boats trying to save a little corn which they saw above the water in their cornfields. Testimony was given yesterday that some of them tried to gather their peanuts and waded into the water to try to get them out before they had sprouted and soured. The sweet potato crop had sprouted or was rotting on the ground, and the hay was covered with a silt deposit from the water that stood over it. I wish the Senator from Ohio could have seen the conditions himself. Now we are asking that an appropriation shall be made so that these people may have some feed for their work animals as well as fertilizer to aid them in making crops.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I think I would have no hesitancy in voting for the measure if it were limited to seed, and I wonder whether the Senator from South Carolina can not agree to an amendment of that kind?

Mr. SMITH. To do what?

Mr. FESS. To limit the relief to a supply of seed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, such a thing would be absolutely futile. I wish the Senator from Ohio could understand that unless the farmers are helped to buy fertilizer, which is the *sine qua non* in the States affected—and there is not a Senator from that section who will not testify to that fact—the use of seed would be an idle gesture.

Mr. President, I want my colleagues to be thoroughly familiar with the facts. I am setting them forth just as they are, and what I say is subject to the corroboration of my colleagues from the stricken region.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me, why he would confine the relief to be afforded to the supplying of seeds, if the ground would not bear anything after the seeds were planted?

Mr. FESS. I had in mind the precedent which we are about to establish. Heretofore we have not, as I remember, gone farther in affording relief in such cases than to make provision for a supply of seed.

Mr. BORAH. I supposed the objective we have had in mind all the time was relief.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. And if we can only accord relief by enlarging the scope, I should suppose that would be the proper thing to do. In other words, heretofore, perhaps, the furnishing of seed was sufficient to effectuate relief, but, according to the facts here, it does not seem to be so.

Mr. FESS. That is the question that I am raising—whether the situation can not be satisfied by limiting the joint resolution to supplying seed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. With the Senator's permission, I should like to say that the furnishing of seed would not reach this situation. If the purpose of Congress is to extend aid, it will be necessary to include fertilizer. When a case of emergency is found by the Secretary of Agriculture to exist, as the Senator from South Carolina has said, fertilizer is necessary as well as seed.

Then there is an additional reason: This is not an appropriation to be distributed to distressed farmers without the hope of return. It is an appropriation to be loaned by the Secretary of Agriculture where he finds an actual emergency existing in any part of the region of Florida, Georgia, or South Carolina, such as is described in this resolution. The loan is, of course, to be secured, and under the custom prevailing it will be impossible properly to secure a loan merely for the seed with which to plant the crop. The security must necessarily cover the crop; and the crop can not be separated into two forms of security, so to speak. In other words, if the seed is to be supplied, the land must be fertilized before a crop can be grown, and the Government can obtain real security for the advance necessary to cover both the seed and the fertilizer.

Ordinarily, the furnishing of seed might meet an emergency of this kind. That could only be true where a large expenditure for fertilizer was unnecessary. With us, it is absolutely indispensable. Since the Government would not make any loan in any emergency case in any part of these three States with-

out at least a first lien upon the crop, it would be most difficult for the farmer to obtain his fertilizer upon a second or a third lien. Therefore it is not only advisable from the standpoint of the Government, if loans are to be made at all, but it is indispensable to the farmer that he be able to procure money for seed and for fertilizer, so that he may execute a lien on his crops insuring the repayment of the money.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I had not gone into the situation fully. I simply read the joint resolution, and thought it was going further than we go ordinarily; and I was somewhat tardy about giving my support to the joint resolution, although it is a relief measure, unless it is absolutely essential. I rather think the observations made by the Senator from Georgia have explained the matter satisfactorily.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make an additional statement, while the territory in which this relief is to be administered is generally described as the Southeastern States, yet every loan is to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture under such rules as he may prescribe; and, reading the joint resolution, of course, the Secretary of Agriculture will extend aid in no instance except where an actual emergency is found to exist as the result of the storms which commenced in Florida on August 11 and continued through the storm of September 19.

Mr. President I do not believe there will be ultimate loss to the Government in this instance, because the money is to be loaned; it is to be loaned upon fair security; it is to be loaned to farmers residing in a section where the making of crops is not experimental; where, through generation after generation, the farmers have been able to make a crop at least sufficient to repay the primary advances for seed and for fertilizer.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Am I to understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that he has included in his joint resolution only Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no; the joint resolution speaks for itself. It refers to the Southeastern States affected by the storm. That includes the Senator's State as well—Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has limited the loan that may be made to one person to a thousand dollars, has he?

Mr. SMITH. No; \$3,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply wanted to say, Mr. President, in addition to what has been said by the Senators from South Carolina and Georgia, that probably the effects of the storm to which they have alluded were not quite so disastrous in North Carolina as they were farther south; but in all the coastal counties of North Carolina the damage was very great.

Mr. SMITH. In some portions it was almost equal to the damage in any of the others.

Mr. SIMMONS. In some portions it was equal to that in South Carolina. I do not know so much about Florida.

The Senators from South Carolina and Georgia have correctly stated the situation with reference to the necessities of the farmer. The crops which we have in North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia are entirely different from those cultivated in the West.

The question of seed is usually not nearly so important with us as it is in the West. We cultivate cotton, tobacco, and corn. The seed is an important item, but not anything like so important as it is in the sections where they grow small grain and where a large quantity of seed is necessary in order to cover a moderate-sized farm.

Mr. SMITH. May I state to the Senator right there, that in this particular instance, perhaps for the first time in the history of this region as to corn and cotton, the excessive rain preceding the storm, and the storm coming at a time when the cotton was open, and it being very warm, most of the seed germinated or was so affected by the moisture that under a test made—I presume by a Government official—I am informed that there was but 30 per cent germination; 65 per cent of the cottonseed tested was unfit for planting, and that condition covers a vast area. I know it has affected mine, but I have not yet had tests made to enable me to say to what extent. As for corn, the corn used for seed purposes throughout the coastal plain was practically destroyed.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is right. I have myself seen cotton in the field where the lint was washed away to such an extent that the seed could be seen; and, of course, damage would follow, and germination be made impossible with such seed under those circumstances. So it would be necessary for

the farmers to buy seed. Ordinarily, they save their seed; but this year a great many of the farmers would not feel safe in doing that.

While the question of seed supply is negligible as compared with that of fertilizer, it would be very helpful; there is no question about that; but if the bill were limited to seed alone, I do not think it would be worth while to pass it.

Mr. SMITH. No, no.

Mr. SIMMONS. The subject of fertilizer is one of great importance to these people. I want to say to the Senator from Ohio that the people who cultivate most of the crops in my State, particularly in eastern North Carolina—and I assume that is true especially in South Carolina and Georgia—are people of very moderate means. They are not landowners. They are what we call tenants. They rent a small farm—a two or three horse farm, as we call it—and, as a rule, they have to borrow money for their fertilizer every year; either that, or they have to pay very high time prices.

At one time it was an easy matter for these tenants to borrow this money from the banks upon what are known as chattel mortgages, but that time has now passed. Our banks have stopped lending on chattel mortgages.

The farmers, as a rule, have to mortgage their crops to the fertilizer producers, and have to pay the high time prices. Generally, I should say, the interest and the price increase on time transactions which they must pay amount to at least 25 per cent.

The fertilizer people in our section are also in trouble. The banks are in trouble. The small tenant farmers are in trouble. All of those circumstances combined create a situation where, if the farming operations of those sections are to be carried out successfully this year, as in former years, it is absolutely necessary that we have some measure of relief from some other source. If it is not obtained from the Government, we must shift and try to get it somewhere else. We can not get it in our immediate section.

The Senator is right. In my section of the country our lands are not productive unless they are highly fertilized. The fertilizer bill, therefore, is the main item of cost in making a crop in that section; and these tenants have to secure it in any way they can. I really apprehend that unless something is done to relieve this situation it will result in a very grave curtailment of production in the southeastern States.

At best, Mr. President, fertilizer is very expensive. A great many farmers use as much as a ton of fertilizer per acre. Certain high-grade fertilizer will cost from \$35 to \$40 a ton. Sometimes only half a ton is used; sometimes not quite so much; but fertilizer is just as important to us, as the Senator said, as irrigation is to the western country. In the western country irrigation is furnished the farmers by the Government, of course, upon terms of repayment; but our farmers are not asking charity. They expect to pay back this money; and if the Secretary of Agriculture is ordinarily cautious he will be able to make loans that will be adequately secured, and the loss to the Government, if any, will be negligible. It certainly will not be any greater than the loss to the Government through affording irrigation facilities in the West.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to state in this connection, speaking of this necessity for fertilization, that during the World War the price of nitrogen went to something like \$100 a ton. It is now about \$60 a ton. I got through an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to enable the Government to go down to Chile and get this stuff and sell it to the farmers. We bought that fertilizer through the Government appropriation, never lost a dollar, and when the accounts were settled up we found that we had estimated a little too much for the cost of distribution that we had added to the cost of the stuff itself, and the Government was the better by \$50,000. In other words, every dollar that was appropriated for the purchase and sale of this ingredient to the farmers on the Atlantic seaboard was repaid and there was \$50,000 excess.

Mr. President, I have stated the situation; and I hope now this body will grant to our people the same relief that they have granted to the people of Porto Rico.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some questions?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. I desire to inquire if either of the States has taken any action, through its legislature or otherwise, to afford this relief?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not doubt that when the legislature meets in my State it will do all that it can, but the Senator, without my going into any very great detail, can understand why the relief from that source is very doubtful. I do not care to discuss here now the situation which may exist in the different States of the Union, but I am sure the Senator will

understand that we would not have come here to ask relief from the Government if it had not been a case of necessity.

Mr. BLAINE. I would like to inquire of the Senator if any special session of the legislature has been called.

Mr. SMITH. In my State the legislature meets in January.

Mr. BLAINE. There was no call for a special session for this emergency?

Mr. SMITH. No. I think the authorities recognize that if they called the legislature there would scarcely be any available means of relief on account of the distressing condition that has existed in the purely agricultural States for the last eight or nine years.

Mr. BLAINE. I would like to make another inquiry. Is there anything in the constitution of either of the States affected which would prevent them from furnishing the relief to those in distress in their particular States?

Mr. SMITH. I think there is.

Mr. BLAINE. I observe that the resolution fixes the maximum at \$3,000; that is, for seed, fertilizer, and feed for work stock. It would appear, just on a casual survey of the situation, that anyone who required \$3,000 worth of seed, fertilizer, and feed for work stock would be the owner of a very large farm undertaking or estate. Why should not such a person undertake to obtain a loan through the sources that are available?

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator is thoroughly conversant with the ordinary condition of agriculture, he will know that the larger the holding, the greater the liability, if it is in farm land. I am glad the Senator asked that question for this reason—and I will submit the matter to any one owning land to any extent—that the landlord is perhaps in as bad condition as the tenant, or worse.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator that a great many of them already have their lands encumbered in the Federal loan banks.

Mr. SMITH. To the limit.

Mr. BLAINE. In other words, they are land poor.

Mr. SMITH. They are worse than land poor. Their lands have been mortgaged, these last few years, giving rise to the paramount issue in America of farm relief. We need not go into that. The Senator certainly is advised, if he is acquainted with the farm at all, that the average tenant has no resources except the immediate crop, and he does not have very much of that.

Coming to the question of \$3,000, where a man who has 8 or 10 or a dozen tenants on his farm, he is held responsible for the living of every one of those families. To illustrate, take one of my farms. I have some 10 or 12 families which run a crop on the land. They have no financial standing, they have no credit.

I furnish them their fertilizer, their stock, the feed for the stock, and a sufficient amount to feed and clothe the families while they are making their crops; and we share the proceeds of the crop, so that I may be able to pay back my loans and they pay for the advances they make. Unless I am able to get a sufficient amount to enable those poor people to live, they can not get along at all.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to another question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. Generally throughout the United States individual farmers, running into the tens of thousands, lose their feed crops. In those cases, as far as I know, there has never been any legislative relief, though the exigency of the case is just as serious as where there is a great group affected by some disaster. Some farmers can not obtain relief, and so they sell their livestock and await the beneficence of Providence to enable them to produce a crop in the succeeding year to take the place of that which they have lost. Is not this the first instance where relief has been offered or suggested to include the feeding of livestock?

In 1922 or thereabouts, when the drought affected the wheat-growing States of the Northwest, the farmers there were permitted to borrow not exceeding \$300, as I remember, for the purpose of purchasing seed wheat. If the suggestion of this measure is to become a public policy, then there should be relief in the case of these individual farmers, who no doubt number tens of thousands, who have suffered the loss of their crops and their buildings and their barns on account of local tornadoes and cyclones devastating only small areas, but innumerable areas throughout the country, some of them losing their crops through drought, some in the lowlands and valleys through floods, some losing their buildings on account of conflagration, and many other causes of tremendous destruction. Those individual farmers suffer just as keenly as do the sufferers where the devastation is of a wider extent, so far as the individuals

are concerned. While they are spread over a larger area, their losses may be as great or greater. Would the Senator, therefore, suggest that in those cases there ought to be general legislation or specific legislation?

Mr. SMITH. Where the devastation does not cover such a wide area, and there may be few who suffer, the local communities can absorb the loss. We have had tornadoes in our State. The Senator speaks of us establishing this as a policy. I hope the weather will not establish as a policy this thing that occurred for the first time in the history of the country. If it does, we will not come back. If it is to be a permanent policy of the weather that a hurricane, the like of which has never been recorded in the history of the Weather Bureau, shall come on the heels of an unprecedented rain precipitation of 90 days, if that is to become the policy of the weather, then I quit now. We are no more likely to have this a policy than the weather is likely to have this disaster as its policy. But the Senator will not gainsay that when a disaster as extensive as this and as destructive as this comes, the organized society of America may not respond through an expression of the Senate.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I just want to suggest to the Senator that I am not opposing his resolution. I have every reason, so far as I am concerned, to promote by legislation the interests of those who suffer because of some terrible calamity that befalls them through no fault of theirs; but I was endeavoring to obtain the Senator's views from a general-policy standpoint, because where the loss is an individual loss it is just as great to the individual as is the loss to the respective individuals over a large area.

Where there is a large area I appreciate that the locality may have been wiped out, and therefore local aid could not be obtained; but I was inquiring whether or not the area was so great or the devastation so great and the financial distress so great that the respective States could not come to the relief of their citizens within their own State.

Mr. SMITH. That is the situation.

Mr. BLAINE. The question with me is as to whether or not this policy should be established generally. I do not think I am in disagreement with the Senator on the general proposition that if this devastation was so great as to wipe out great areas of productive wealth in the farming regions of these States, and that it would be rather impossible for the communities or the State to produce or afford the relief, then I think out of the generosity of the people of the whole country there should come relief.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will mention to the Senator that the area in Florida involved is about a million acres of land, and the loss arising from this storm, unprecedented in our history, as the Senator from South Carolina has said, is estimated at from sixty to one hundred million dollars.

Mr. BLAINE. Just one other question, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit. I inquire whether or not there ought not to be some provision respecting the application for a loan under the measure?

Mr. SMITH. We have left that to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. That is exactly how we dealt with that matter in reference to the seed; it is the identical wording.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I note that in 1922, when an act was passed for the purchase of seed in certain crop-failure areas of the West, a provision was added fixing a penalty for anyone who knowingly made any false representation in an effort to obtain benefits under that act. I am entirely in sympathy with the purposes of the Senator's resolution, and I wish to inquire of him whether or not he would object to having such a proviso added to his resolution. For the Senator's information, I will read that portion of that act.

Provided, That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this resolution shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

I merely suggest to the Senator that the area involved is rather great and that it might be some protection to the Secretary in administering the resolution, assuming that it passes, if such a penalty were provided.

Mr. SMITH. I think there would be no objection, only I think it would be a futile thing. We would have to imprison them, because they would not have anything with which to pay a fine. Seriously, however, I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I do not think this amendment should be put on the pending measure. I fear that it would be a reflection on the people of this afflicted area in

South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and a portion of my State. No such provision was made in the Porto Rican measure providing for loans to individuals of not over \$25,000 each. Under the pending joint resolution we can not loan more than \$3,000 to any one man. The matter the Senator has in mind is sufficiently safeguarded in the resolution; it is taken care of because it provides that the Secretary shall make no loans until he is satisfied, on the facts submitted to him, that it is a meritorious case, and then he is to be provided with certain securities and is to be satisfied with the paper executed to him for the Government. I think that is sufficient.

Of course, I would be in favor of punishing anybody who would undertake to defraud the Government or to practice deception on it, but since we approved the measure and have extended aid to the people of Porto Rico, where a few millions have been appropriated to grant relief to them, without providing any penalty for any such deception practiced upon the Government, I think it is not proper to put such a provision in this resolution regarding citizens of the United States who have been so sorely afflicted as those people have in the recent floods of the South.

Mr. SMITH. I have no objection to the amendment for the reason that I am sure there will be no case of the kind in that region, and if there should be it ought to be punished. I do not think that any such case will arise. Personally, I have no objection to the amendment. I do not think it is a reflection on anyone to safeguard the loans.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me I would like to make a reply to the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to say to the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Wisconsin intends no reflection upon the citizens of the afflicted area.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am satisfied of that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The fact is that when a very similar act was passed in 1922 for the relief of the crop-failure areas in the Northwest, where the amount to be obtained by an individual was limited to only \$300, I find that this provision for penalty for false representation was contained. It seems to me, in fairness to the Cabinet officer who will be required to enforce the terms of the resolution, should it be passed, that it would be a matter of wisdom to provide such a penalty. I shall offer the amendment at the proper time when I may obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. There are a number of instances where Congress has appropriated money for the relief of people who had suffered by reason of fire or flood or earthquake. I find an appropriation was made by Congress to the French West Indies to relieve those people who suffered from an earthquake. I remember voting for an appropriation when the San Francisco earthquake came and did a great deal of damage there, killing a great many people and destroying a great deal of property. I remember when the fire swept Salem, Mass., we voted the amount asked for without any question. I remember when the World War was raging Congress appropriated \$100,000,000 for the distressed and starving people of Europe. I remember when we opened our hearts and appropriated \$20,000,000 at one time for the relief of suffering people of Russia. So Congress has risen nobly to those occasions, and I have no doubt it will do so now.

I am on the committee that reported the resolution favorably. The Senator from South Carolina made a statement before that committee, as did the Congressmen from South Carolina, who appeared before us, showing beyond all question that the appropriation is needed. The same situation exists as to Georgia and Florida. Two or three counties in my State were involved, though I do not know to what extent and whether they will ask for relief or not. They are at liberty to do so under this resolution.

One of the witnesses testified that he saw, in this flood over in South Carolina, where the crops and even the houses were covered with water and the household effects were under water for days, the livestock destroyed, the crops destroyed, and these people now have nothing to subsist upon. They are destitute, very blue, and very despondent. As the Senator from South Carolina has said, if they do not get this relief, they have got to give up farm operations in that section and go somewhere and start life over again in a new field, if they can find anything

to do. I think Congress ought to appropriate the money, and I believe that it will do so.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have concluded my appeal to this body, and I now express the hope that the Senate will take the action which the situation justifies.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I would not now take the time of the Senate if I thought there was any chance of voting upon the pending joint resolution at this time. But it is generally known and understood here that there is a small-sized filibuster on, and that if the joint resolution should be voted on before 2 o'clock there would be a motion made to take up the so-called cruiser bill. Therefore it is the cruiser bill and the peace pact that I desire to discuss briefly.

I am sorry that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], is not now in his seat, because I was in hopes that my honeyed words might appeal to him.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. BURTON in the chair]. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. With pleasure.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would ask the Senator from Mississippi if we could have action upon the joint resolution right away without any debate?

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that I would gladly yield if we could get a vote on the proposition; but I understand that the Senator from Maine is going to make a motion to take up his naval cruiser bill before 2 o'clock in the event we pass the resolution, and there could be no debate upon the motion to take up that bill in that event and, therefore, that discussion of the joint resolution is to proceed until at least 2 o'clock.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that there will be no vote upon the joint resolution now before us until about one minute before 2 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. That was the understanding I had.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I did not clearly understand the remark of the Senator from Utah. Will he kindly repeat his statement?

Mr. KING. There will be no vote upon the joint resolution pending, because a number of us desire to speak, until about five minutes or one minute before 2 o'clock. I want to speak.

Mr. SMITH. I understand, but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the parliamentary situation ought not to be allowed, in the final outcome of this measure, to deny the suffering people the relief which the measure would give them. We ought to pass it to-day because the first of the year is nearly here when they must know whether or not they can carry on.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree with the Senator, but he heard what the Senator from Utah has said and what other Senators have said, so I am going to occupy the time of the Senate for a few moments in the hope that my admonition and appeal will be accepted by certain other Senators.

Mr. SIMMONS. Upon investigation I find the situation is very much as the Senator from Mississippi states. If the resolution is attempted to be passed now, it would just result in probable delay to accomplish some other purpose. I am reliably informed that immediately after 2 o'clock there will be no disposition to interfere further with the passage of the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HARRISON. That is my understanding.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have been so informed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, two of the most important questions confronting the Senate are the proposed bills touching cruiser construction and the so-called Kellogg peace pact. I want it understood in the beginning that I am not opposed to an adequate Navy. I have never been styled in any sense of the word a pacifist. I have always voted for an adequate Navy and I hope I always shall.

I will assume for the sake of argument that the 15 cruisers provided for in the proposed legislation are needed by the Government to give to the United States a well-rounded Navy. I will assume for the sake of argument that the bill should have been passed by the Senate within a week after its passage last March by the House of Representatives. I will assume, for the sake of argument, that the Government has suffered a great deal through the negligence of those who have directed the destinies of this proposal. I will assume, for the sake of argument, that the Naval Board and the Navy Department and this administration were wrong a year ago when they said that in order for the Government to have a well-rounded Navy we ought to expend something over a billion dollars. I will further assume,

for the sake of argument, that the Naval Board and the Navy Department and this administration were wrong when they put their support behind the House legislation at first and asked that more than \$700,000,000 be appropriated to give us a well-rounded Navy. I will ever further assume, for the sake of argument, that the administration now occupies the correct position in asking for an outlay of only \$270,000,000 when formerly it asked for approximately \$1,000,000,000 to give us a well-rounded Navy.

Assuming all those things to be true, yet the question that confronts me is, Why do we in one hand hold a peace pact for the preservation of peace throughout the world and in the other a bundle of explosives to burst upon the world? I want to address myself to the inconsistency of such a position. I want to address myself to the psychology of the situation that confronts the Senate. I wonder to myself what the peoples of the world will think of our attitude in handing to them at this particular time a peace pact renouncing war and at the same time, through the proposed bill, making plans and preparations for war?

Now, I am merely wondering how my genial and good friend from Maine, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. HALE], is going to answer that proposition. I am wondering what this administration is going to say when it tries to reconcile those two views. Is there not some incongruity between the State and Navy Departments?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I can answer the Senator very easily when I get the floor with my bill, as I hope to do before long.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I know; but I hope that the words that I am going to speak will dissuade the Senator from bringing up his bill. I am wondering why, Mr. President, for more than eight months the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and the steering committee of this body sat supinely and made no effort, to speak of, to push the proposed cruiser bill to passage, but suddenly he was aroused just as the Foreign Relations Committee reports out the peace pact, and now wants to supersede it. Certainly such action is as much ridiculous as it is confusing.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi knows very well that every attempt was made to bring up the cruiser bill, but that it was found impossible to do so.

Mr. HARRISON. I know that the Senator from Maine has in his own heart wanted to bring the bill up, but the trouble is that he has not been supported in his desire. The committee has not supported him and the administration has not supported him.

Mr. HALE. Yes; they have supported me in every way possible.

Mr. HARRISON. That puts them in a worse attitude than I thought they were. I can not understand how any administration that prates and proclaims to the world that it is for this peace pact can at the same time want to give the impression to the world that it is a lie and say that it is for building bigger armaments and undergoing an additional outlay of two hundred and seventy-odd million dollars for naval construction.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the report has been circulated by leaders of thought in this country, that editorials have been written, and men from the pulpit and the rostrum have proclaimed, that this proposed multilateral peace pact is but milk and water; that it does not mean anything; that it is not worth the paper on which it is written; that it is merely a gesture without courage back of it to put into effect any measure to prevent war and to preserve the peace of the world. I am not unmindful of all those caustic criticisms, and the attitude of the Senator from Maine and of the administration, if he is correct in the last statement he has made, would give dignity to some of those assertions that it is milk and water; that it is merely a gesture, that it is a fraud, that it is a sham, that it is a pretense; but for my part I will not accept that contention. I believe that the peace treaty is offered in good faith. I have more confidence in the administration than has my friend from Maine and some others in this body or elsewhere in the country. I can not believe that this administration would be guilty of such perfidious action as to say that the peace pact does not mean anything; that it is not offered in good faith. I say, Mr. President, that, while it does not go so far as I would go, it is a step in the right direction, and throughout my public service I have always accepted any proposals that tend to the peace of the world. This proposal was conceived in such a spirit. It means something. It means that if the nations who are signatories to it will abide by it, we shall have no more wars

because war is renounced, and the peace of the world will be preserved. But I say to my genial friend from Maine, I say to the steering committee of this body, I say to the administration and to the country, that if we would have the nations of the world believe that we are in good faith, that we are sincere in this proposal, that we believe it means what it says, we ought to get wholeheartedly behind it and unanimously support it. Do not let us do it faintheartedly, do not let us tender it to the people as you would tender an invitation to me to come to your home to dinner and at the same time write a postscript saying "I do not mean it." That is what your unseemly action now would indicate. That is what the world will say if we offer this peace pact to the world, and at the same time set it aside, supersede it, and say, "Oh, let us build more cruisers; we need them to have a great Navy."

The late former chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, one of the best men whom I ever knew, Mr. Butler, said when this bill was up for consideration on the floor of the House that it was but the beginning of a program that would call for an outlay of three and one-half billion dollars. If we are going to have peace in the world, if all the nations of the world agree here to renounce war and adopt nothing but policies that tend toward peace, why should we be so insistent at this time on appropriating—because that is what it means—more than \$270,000,000 dollars to add to the armament of the United States?

Mr. President, under the present administration we have had eight years of vacillation and isolation. Already irreparable damage has been done to the influence of this Government in the eyes of the world. And at this time, it matters not to me from what source the suggestion comes, I am willing to help the administration make amends in at least some small way for its past deportment. In so far as this Nation is concerned, this peace pact is of value even though it marks the facing about and the end of a policy of isolation.

We are an essential part of the world. We have a vital stake in the peace of the world, and our economic and political interests are such that we can not afford to intrust them to others, and our obligations are such that they can not be discharged by others.

The peace pact "condemns a recourse to war and renounces it as an instrument of national policy." It pledges "the settlement of all disputes of whatever origin by pacific means." That is a great forward step in the progress of peace. In the actual renunciation of all wars the pact goes further even than the covenant of the League of Nations. Of course, the nations which are members of the league and are also parties to this treaty, and practically all of them will be, are binding themselves to much less than they did when they signed the covenant of the league. Under the covenant of the league, nations are permitted to go to war at the expiration of nine months in case they have lived up to their obligations to seek, during that period provided for by the covenant, a settlement of the disputes at issue. And this pact will fill a gap in the covenant of the league in that it even renounces resort to war after the nine months of conciliation and arbitration.

And so this pact, while it in no way affects the orderly operations in the interest of world peace as provided for in the covenant of the league, will broaden and make strong the obligations upon the part of the nations to preserve peace.

Before the establishment of the League of Nations it was deemed to be an essential prerogative of sovereignty for a nation to wage war whenever it saw fit. The nations which joined the league solemnly renounced that right, and this undoubtedly marked the greatest advance that has ever been made, or ever will be made, toward doing away with war as an instrument of national policy. It was through the genius and leadership of a great American that our Government made an invaluable contribution to world peace and justice through the establishment of the league and the World Court, which have in such a short time, and under many handicaps, including, I may say, the lack of support from the United States, more than justified the hopes that were centered about them. In the words of Elihu Root, one of the ablest of all American statesmen, uttered two years ago:

The league in the political field and the court in the judicial field have been rendering the best services in the cause of peace known to the history of civilization, incomparably the best.

The league and the court were created at a time of great need, but, under the difficult circumstances that came in the wake of the World War that had shaken the foundations of civilizations, it was difficult to take such a forward step in the face of all the reactions to prejudice, greed, and passion that came after the war; and it would not have been possible to do so had it not been for the indomitable will and the courage and

genius of Woodrow Wilson, who had a vision of a world organized for peace, which he never lost sight of, and who pressed forward with a steadfast purpose until he had reached an advanced position that is now occupied by most of the nations of the world. Russia and Mexico, torn by internal strife, held back, and our Government, listening to those who preached a crass and sordid materialism, or moved by partisan consideration, turned her back upon that great vision and refused to march in the big parade for the preservation of peace throughout the world.

And in consideration of this peace pact, presented yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], at the instance of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body, given to us by this Republican administration, as a Democrat I refuse to do to some of my colleagues on the Republican side and to the administration respecting it what most of them and the administration did to us in the League of Nations fight.

I prefer to place the interest of the country and the cause of peace above party, and still hope, whether I am following the leadership of a Republican or a Democrat, for this great country to again carry the moral leadership of the world.

I am not deceived into believing that we can banish war by merely signing a treaty which frowns upon it, and then do nothing to prevent it. I believe that we have a bigger part to play in international affairs than we have played during the last eight years. We can not detach ourselves from the rest of the world and supinely sit, and disinterestedly say that we have no interest to serve, nor obligation to discharge in taking an active part in organizing the world for peace. If that is to be our Government's policy in the future, then I would say, it is better to let this treaty alone, because if we become parties to the treaty in that spirit, it may do more harm than good.

I am assuming that this peace pact is offered by this Government in good faith. I am assuming that this administration sees the error of its way and that many of those who refused to cooperate in making the league the great success that it is, have recoiled and are now willing to lend their influence in seeing that this Government play a man's part in world affairs.

I have never doubted the high motives and the fine qualities of sincerity that have prompted the present Secretary of State in his movements toward peace. As a distinguished Member of this body, Secretary Kellogg cooperated to the limit in standing by the cause of peace and in having this Government assume some of its responsibilities as a great world power in making the league a success. Those of us who were in the thickest of that fight will not forget that as a Senator at that time, the present Secretary of State used every effort and all of his influence upon recalcitrant Republican colleagues, that he might persuade them to agree to such reservations as would carry us into the league without sacrificing any of the sovereign rights of this Nation.

The suggestion of our Secretary of State to Monsieur Briand that this proposal of France for a separate pact between France and our Government be made a multilateral treaty, and other nations be invited to join, is in keeping with his conception and policies to prevent war and preserve the peace of the world through international cooperation and reciprocal obligations. When I vote for this peace pact, as I shall, I am confident, if those who direct the destinies of this Nation are sincere in their advocacy of it—and I believe they are—that it will lead to a more active policy upon our part in international affairs.

I know that if disputes are not to be settled by resort to arms, and that is what the peace pact obligates the signatories not to do, then means must be established by resorting to reason and conciliation either at the conference table or in the courts. So, while this peace pact does not provide the instrumentalities nor the agencies to which we and the other nations to it must resort, it is logical to suppose that it will be followed by other agreements or other understandings pointing the way in which these questions must be solved peacefully. The only agency in the world that offers the orderly processes through which questions that threaten war may be solved is the Covenant of the League of Nations. The irresistible forces of peace, security, and justice lead us toward it daily; and this is one of the steps carrying us in the direction of Geneva.

In 1921 we held a disarmament conference here in the city of Washington. We agreed upon a plan, and from that conference we went out and scrapped \$400,000,000 worth of armaments. Secretary Hughes and President Harding at that time journeyed forth throughout the country and magnified the accomplishments of that disarmament conference. "Oh," they said, "we have achieved much." Then, they held another conference in 1927 to undo some of the things that were done in the 1921 conference, or to do what we had been told was done in 1921. That conference failed, and it failed primarily, because

we refused to set around a conference table and first dispose of questions, such as the freedom of the seas, for which we think we need a navy. I notice that in the debate in the House on this cruiser bill it was said, "Let us start the construction of these 15 cruisers immediately, because, you know, in 1931, under the action of the 1921 Washington conference, we are going to have another disarmament conference; so we want to get ready for it, and we want to have all these cruisers started and on the way to completion before we have that other disarmament conference. They might then order us to scrap them, as was done in the 1921 conference."

Why the proposed action is ridiculous in the premises! Let us put ourselves wholeheartedly behind this peace pact. I submit that there is no more urgent reason for passing the cruiser bill at this particular time than there was a year ago. I submit that if we want to, we can pass it six months from now just as easily; but if we want to show the world that we are really for peace, that this peace pact really means something, let us concentrate our efforts on that. Let us discuss peaceable questions, preparations and plans for peace, rather than at this particular time to be discussing and making preparations and plans for another war.

I submit that the psychology is bad, that it will destroy our prestige and work injury to our influence with other nations.

I know there may be some who will say that this peace pact will involve us in such controversy that we will need a gigantic navy in order to back it up. If that is the view of the administration, if that is the logic of the contention of the administration and those who support it here, then, of course, you admit in the beginning that your peace pact is worthless. If you think you need a great, big navy to help it out, construe it, and put it in force, all right; take that argument, if you wish; but I do not accept it.

I believe that the pact means what it says, and that we ought to invite other nations to join it, and that we ought to show them by our action here that we are wholeheartedly for it, and that we ought not to take up the consideration of the cruiser bill at this particular time. The measure of good that will come from our passing the peace pact will very largely depend upon the vitality we put into our action in its consideration.

At this season of the year when we are looking forward to the celebration of the coming of the Prince of Peace, when angels will be singing "Peace on earth, good will toward men," we are preparing to construct, in the circumstances, these 15 cruisers at a cost of \$255,000,000!

I like to think, Mr. President, because there is much sound reasoning in the expression, of the words from the prayer of the old darky in Irwin Russell's Christmas Night in the Quarters, when he said:

De sinfulness ob sin
Is 'pendin' 'pon de sperrit
What we goes an' does it in.

So let us show the right spirit in ratifying this peace pact. Let us make the world believe that we mean at least what we say; and let us defer this cruiser program until a more opportune time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am sorry to differ with my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am in favor of the Kellogg treaty and also the cruiser bill which he opposes. I think Secretary Kellogg has done a great work, and every one should commend him for it. I should like to see the treaty ratified before Christmas, and I will vote to put it ahead of the cruiser bill; but I am just as strongly for the cruiser bill as I am for the Kellogg treaty. I am proud of the fact that I have voted for every measure that would bring about arbitration in settling our differences with other nations instead of going to war, which I consider a relic of barbarism.

I am glad to see the American Legion and the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion here urging the passage of the cruiser bill. I believe that it is for the protection of the people of this country and that it will avoid war. Mrs. Boyce Picklen, jr., of Washington, Ga., one of the leading women of my State, is president of the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion, and with the other officers she has been here urging the passage of the cruiser bill.

Everyone in this country and in the world knows that the United States Navy and Army never will be used for a war of aggression; but the possession of this Navy will make other nations have more respect for us, and will keep us out of war. Congress owes it to the children of coming generations to do everything possible to avoid another war, and George Washington and many of our great men have urged us to prepare in peace times so as to avoid war.

I hope the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] will press this treaty every day and night until it is voted on. I am quite

willing to meet here every day and at night in order to pass the treaty. I hope we can vote on it, as I said, before the Christmas holidays; it would be most appropriate to pass a measure that would help bring about international peace at Christmas time; but I also hope that Senators will not oppose the cruiser bill simply because of the ratification of the Kellogg treaty, as they will both help in keeping peace with our neighbors in all parts of the world.

I was very much interested in reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by one of the ablest and best men in public life in the United States in the last half century, the present occupant of the chair of the Senate [Mr. BURTON in the chair].

I wish every Senator would read his farewell words to the Members of the House, in which he urged international peace, and urged that they assist in its preservation in every way possible.

As I said, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that both the peace treaty and the cruiser bill will be passed without delay.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS AND THE MULTILATERAL TREATY

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it is quite evident that the joint resolution now before the Senate can not be passed before 2 o'clock. I am entirely willing, if the motion I am about to make prevails, to allow unanimous consent to take up the joint resolution for the rest of the afternoon.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 11526, Order of Business No. 1022, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HALE. The motion is not debatable; but I will state, Mr. President, that it is not a violation of the agreement. The motion is in order at any time before 2 o'clock.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I very much hope the Senate will dispose of the joint resolution to-day.

Relief for the farmers and fruit growers in the storm area of Florida—which is but a very limited portion of my State—and the farmers of other sections in the Southeastern States should not be further delayed. As will be recalled more than two weeks ago at the time the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] introduced the Porto Rican resolution in the Senate, I immediately addressed the Senate in an appeal for aid for Florida farmers and growers who had suffered so severely from the storm of the past fall.

Later when the Porto Rican resolution came before the Senate from the committee, I proposed an amendment to authorize loans and advances to the farmers and fruit growers of Florida who had suffered so severely from the same hurricane that wrought such appalling destruction in Porto Rico. My amendment with the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] was by the Senate referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I then appeared before that committee and further appealed for aid for the unfortunates in Florida. Two or three times having spoken before the Senate and having appeared before the Committee on Agriculture it would be useless for me to speak further. What I desire is action without further delay. I think, however, the resolution should have a minor amendment that it may be made absolutely certain that its provisions will fit the Florida situation. When I have an opportunity I will offer this amendment which I now have prepared and which the Senator [Mr. SMITH], in charge of the resolution has agreed to accept. My amendment would insert on page 1, in line 4, after the word "farmers," the words "and fruit growers," and on the same page, in line 8, after the word "legumes," the words "nursery stock." It is claimed by some that the present wording of the resolution is sufficient to cover fruit growers, as they come under the general term "farmers," but I think it better to amend as I propose. I will offer this amendment when I have an opportunity under the rules.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a point of order has been raised. The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Maine is not debatable.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. A point of order has been raised against the motion submitted by the Senator from Maine; namely, that under the unanimous-consent agreement the submission of the motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no agreement for a final vote under the unanimous-consent arrangement, and the motion of the Senator from Maine is in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall feel constrained to appeal from the decision of the Chair. The understanding of the

unanimous consent was that the resolution was to remain before the Senate until acted upon.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McMaster	Smith
Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Bayard	George	Metcalf	Steck
Bingham	Gerry	Moses	Steinwer
Blaine	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Blease	Goff	Norris	Swanson
Borah	Greene	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burke	Harrison	Pine	Tyson
Burton	Hastings	Pittman	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Couzens	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Curtis	Kendrick	Sackett	Watson
Dale	Keyes	Schall	Wheeler
Deneen	King	Sheppard	
Dill	La Follette	Shipstead	
Edwards	McKellar	Shortridge	
Fess	McLean	Simmons	

Mr. McMASTER. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BLACK] is absent from the Senate on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair wherein the Chair held that the unanimous-consent agreement which in good faith was entered into for the consideration of the joint resolution now before the Senate could be superseded by the motion offered by the Senator from Maine. When it was entered into it was distinctly understood that the joint resolution was to have a favored status legislatively and disposed of during the morning hour to-day. We have relied on that understanding to-day and have referred to the fact that the matter would not be disposed of until the end of the morning hour. May I inquire of the Chair whether the motion is debatable?

Mr. MOSES. A point of order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator certainly has a right to discuss his appeal, as I understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable under the rule.

Mr. MOSES. The motion is not debatable, and an appeal from a ruling on it can not be debated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to proceed to the consideration of the naval bill not being debatable, an appeal from the decision of the Chair holding that motion in order is not debatable.

The unanimous-consent agreement provides that on Thursday morning any report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Senate Joint Resolution 182 shall be considered, but no agreement was made as to time for a final disposition of the resolution. The Chair rules that under those circumstances this motion to proceed to the consideration of the naval bill is in order. The Senator from Utah appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. KING. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MOSES. May the question be stated, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN], who is absent. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] has a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. DENEEN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. GLENN] and to state that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I neglected to announce that I have a pair with the senior Senator

from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], but I am informed that if present he would vote as I have voted on this question. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—63

Barkley	George	McMaster	Simmons
Bayard	Gerry	McNary	Smoot
Bingham	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Borah	Goff	Moses	Steinwer
Broussard	Greene	Norris	Stephens
Burke	Hale	Oddie	Swanson
Burton	Harris	Overman	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Pine	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Pittman	Tyson
Couzens	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Vandenberg
Curtis	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Deneen	Kendrick	Sackett	Warren
Edwards	Keyes	Schall	Waterman
Fess	McKellar	Shipstead	Watson
Fletcher	McLean	Shortridge	

NAYS—13

Blaine	Frazier	Nye	Wheeler
Blease	Hayden	Ransdell	
Brookhart	King	Sheppard	
Dill	La Follette	Smith	

NOT VOTING—19

Ashurst	Gillett	Larrazolo	Robinson, Ark.
Black	Glenn	Mayfield	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Trammell
Copeland	Hawes	Norbeck	Wagner
Edge	Howell	Phipps	

So the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn, and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] has a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. Not knowing how that Senator would vote, I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. LARAZOLO] and let my vote stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—7

Blaine	Brookhart	King	Nye
Blease	Frazier	La Follette	

NAYS—69

Ashurst	Gerry	Metcalf	Smoot
Barkley	Glass	Moses	Steck
Bayard	Goff	Norris	Steinwer
Bingham	Greene	Oddie	Stephens
Borah	Hale	Overman	Swanson
Broussard	Harris	Pine	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Harrison	Pittman	Tydings
Burton	Hastings	Ransdell	Tyson
Capper	Hayden	Reed, Mo.	Vandenberg
Caraway	Heflin	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Jones	Sackett	Warren
Deneen	Kendrick	Schall	Waterman
Dill	Keyes	Sheppard	Watson
Edwards	McKellar	Shipstead	Wheeler
Fess	McLean	Shortridge	
Fletcher	McMaster	Simmons	
George	McNary	Smith	

NOT VOTING—19

Black	Gillett	Larrazolo	Robinson, Ark.
Bratton	Glenn	Mayfield	Thomas, Idaho
Copeland	Gould	Neely	Trammell
Dale	Hawes	Norbeck	Wagner
Edge	Howell	Phipps	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine, which is not debatable.

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to debate it. I desire to submit a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. I submit the following unanimous-consent agreement:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that the so-called cruiser bill (H. R. 11526) be made the unfinished legislative business of the Senate for Thursday, January 3, 1929, at 2 o'clock p. m., and that the so-called multilateral treaty renouncing war be made the unfinished business of the Senate in open executive session on the same day.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Idaho, if this agreement is entered into, what would be his policy in moving to go into open executive session for the consideration of the treaty? Would he undertake to keep the treaty constantly before the Senate if he had the votes to go into open executive session, or would he be inclined to divide the time with those who want to consider the cruiser bill?

Mr. BORAH. I think it would be my duty to ask that the treaty be kept before the Senate. If a majority of the Senate was in favor of it, I would pursue that course.

Mr. HALE. Of course I could not agree with the Senator that we should divide the time between the two matters in any way, as was suggested.

Mr. BORAH. I am not asking unanimous consent to that end. I would feel under obligation to make the motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it would be necessary for the Senator from Idaho to have a majority of the Senate to take up the treaty in open executive session.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the Senate itself have absolute control of which shall be considered first, which shall be considered last, which shall be voted on first, and which voted on last. If Senators believe that a majority rules in a legislative body, I do not see how anyone could object to this agreement which makes these matters the unfinished business of the Senate in preference to all other legislative business. If it is determined to make the cruiser bill the unfinished business in legislative session of the Senate in preference to any other measure, then the Senate is in control as to which shall be considered first, which shall be considered last, which shall be voted on first, and which voted on last. It is the right and privilege of the majority of the Senate absolutely, and not of any one Senator. The Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Maine are not the only ones permitted to make the motion. Any Senator can make the motion to proceed to the consideration of one or the other measure as he sees fit.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is not that just the situation in which the two measures are now placed? They are subject to the control of the majority of the Senate, and I see nothing to be gained by the adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I can see this to be gained with reference to the measure that is now before this body asking relief for farmers down in the flood-stricken areas of the country. If we can get an agreement by which the two measures referred to shall go over, we can transact this other business before Congress adjourns for the holidays.

Mr. BORAH. May I say that this much is to be gained, in my judgment, that if we do not come to some agreement at this time, to-day and to-morrow and the next day will be utilized in creating an unfortunate friction between the two measures?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that he is only postponing the evil day when that friction is bound to be developed?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. It takes a two-thirds vote in executive session of the Senate to provide for the consideration of a treaty as in open executive session. This is a unanimous-consent request which the Senator is submitting and it does not require a two-thirds vote for the treaty to be considered in open executive session, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into. The treaty and the cruiser bill would go over until the 3d of January, thus giving Senators an opportunity to prepare themselves to discuss the measures. We shall in that way accomplish what would otherwise take us two or three days to accomplish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will correct the statement of the Senator from Virginia that it requires a two-thirds vote to consider a treaty in open executive session. It may be

done upon a majority vote. It takes a two-thirds vote to consider the confirmation of a nomination in open executive session.

Mr. SWANSON. It has been decided repeatedly, and the Vice President himself, I believe, has so decided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was on the confirmation of a nomination. The rule expressly provides that a treaty may be considered in open executive session either by unanimous consent or by a majority vote.

Mr. SWANSON. I may be mistaken, but I know I tried to get the Vice President to rule once that a majority should control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Vice President made that decision in accordance with the rule which makes specific provision that a majority vote only is necessary.

Mr. SWANSON. But two days will be lost here if we do not get this unanimous-consent agreement. I am satisfied if we go into executive session the treaty will be made the unfinished business.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is the Senator attempting to have us agree to consider the two measures at the same time?

Mr. BORAH. But in different fashion, one in legislative session and the other in open executive session.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Idaho what time he proposes to occupy in open executive session? How much time does he propose to give to the consideration of the treaty and how much to the consideration of the cruiser bill?

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi and to the Senate that there will be no occasion to quarrel with the Senator from Idaho as to testing the majority of the Senate upon taking up the treaty every day. I want to get the treaty out of the way. I do not desire to take it up before the holidays. I am not attempting to have it taken up before the holidays. Nothing could be gained by doing so.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not want to have the cruiser bill supersede the peace pact?

Mr. BORAH. I do not.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Idaho if he regards either measure as having precedence over the other in the order of consideration when the Senate convenes January 3?

Mr. BORAH. I would regard myself as perfectly free to move to take up the treaty, and I would feel under obligation to make the motion. If the Senate did not see fit to do it, that would be one thing; but I certainly would test it.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I hope he will not regard it as improper. If for any reason the Senator should not be here or should feel constrained to yield temporarily the right of way to some other bill, would the Senator feel that any other Senator was transgressing the proprieties of the occasion if he should move to proceed to the consideration of the treaty in open executive session?

Mr. BORAH. Not at all, but the Senator will have to be apt in order to get ahead of the Senator from Idaho in that respect.

Mr. KING. I am sure if the Senator is here he will do so. I was taking into account the contingency of illness or something of the character.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me, so far as the Senate is concerned, that it faces the issue of deciding which one of the measures is to be taken up for consideration before the other. So far as I am personally concerned I am ready to face that issue now; but if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is in a position where he can not in good faith make that motion prior to adjournment for the holidays, I see something to be accomplished by postponing the issue until that time. For that reason and that reason alone I shall not interpose an objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if this unanimous-consent request shall be agreed to, of course, the motion made by the Senator from Maine will be withdrawn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be.

Mr. KING. It will be superseded.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator from Maine say anything?

Mr. KING. Silence gives consent.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Maine did not have to say anything when the Chair spoke.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as one of the opponents of the proposition to take up for consideration the cruiser bill in advance of the treaty, in view of the explanations and statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations,

I shall not oppose the proposed unanimous-consent agreement; but I deplore that we are not to have an opportunity of voting upon the treaty before the Christmas holidays. Even though it be considered as a gesture, as some Senators have said, I think that it would be a magnificent gesture if we were to ratify the treaty before adjournment for the holidays and thus give some additional evidence of the sincere desire of the United States to promote the cause of world peace. Imperfect and unsatisfactory as the treaty is, it will be regarded by millions of people in this and other lands as an effective movement toward international fellowship and the abolition of war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that vacates the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will be withdrawn.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Southeastern United States.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think now in good faith that Senate Joint Resolution 182 should be proceeded with and a vote be taken upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution of the Senator from South Carolina is the pending business.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Utah yield for one moment?

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the Senator from Utah will withhold his motion for a moment until we may get a vote on the joint resolution of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Utah withhold his motion until we may dispose of the joint resolution? Mr. SMOOT. I am willing to do so if it shall not take very long.

Mr. SMITH. I ask for a vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the pending joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment will be agreed to. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this resolution shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months or both.

Mr. SMITH. I accept the amendment, Mr. President. I think it is a very pertinent one.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. REED of Missouri. One moment. I should like to have the amendment again stated. I failed to catch its full import.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I say to the Senator from Missouri that that provision has been in most of the similar measures which have been passed by Congress? As the Senator will observe, it applies only to those who "knowingly" make false statements in order to obtain relief under the provisions of the joint resolution.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is the word "material" in the resolution so as to read "material false representation"?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That word should be in the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I took the language from previous similar acts and resolutions which have been passed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think the word "material" ought to be placed in the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am perfectly willing to have that word inserted in the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not want to take time; I merely wish to say that, as a matter of principle, I think it is a very

doubtful thing to be multiplying penal statutes. They are so often abused by Federal authorities in these days that we ought to be careful about them. If the words "willful and material" were inserted in the resolution, perhaps it would not be so bad.

Mr. FLETCHER. The word "material" should be inserted before the word "representation."

Mr. SMITH. I suggest the insertion of the word "material" where indicated by the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment as it is proposed to be amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After the word "any," in the first line of the amendment, I suggest the insertion of the word "material."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. As proposed to be amended, the amendment would read:

That any person who shall knowingly make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment as modified is agreed to.

Mr. KING. I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "resolution," it is proposed to insert the words "including all expenses and charges incurred in so doing."

Mr. SMITH. That is all right; I accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move to insert after the word "farmers" the words "fruit growers," because the word "farmer" might not be broad enough to cover fruit growers; a fruit grower may not be classified as a farmer. I want to make the joint resolution broad enough to cover fruit growers.

Mr. HEFLIN. The joint resolution was intended to reach the fruit growers, and I think that amendment ought to be made.

Mr. SMITH. Very well; I accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to insert, after the word "legumes," in line 8, page 1, the words "nursery stock," so that it will cover seeds and nursery stock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 56. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue receipts to senders for ordinary mail of any character and to fix the fees chargeable therefor;

H. R. 57. An act to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service;

H. R. 6864. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry the mail when tendered;

H. R. 10441. An act to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909;

H. R. 12415. An act to grant freedom of postage in the United States domestic service to the correspondence of the members of the Diplomatic Corps and consuls of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States;

H. R. 13114. An act to amend section 197 of the Criminal Code (sec. 320, title 18, U. S. C.); and

H. R. 15386. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4302. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Federal Point Lighthouse Reservation, N. C., to the city of Wilmington, N. C., as a memorial to commemorate the Battle of Fort Fisher; and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution limiting the operation of sections 198 and 203 of title 18 of the Code of Laws of the United States.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CURTIS presented the credentials of DAVID A. REED, chosen a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania for the term commencing March 4, 1929, which were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

IN THE NAME AND BY AUTHORITY OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1928, DAVID A. REED was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1929.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal here to affixed at the city of Harrisburg, this 18th day of December, A. D. 1928.

JOHN S. FISHER.

By the governor:
[SEAL]

CHARLES JOHNSON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

(The credentials were accompanied by a certificate showing the returns of votes cast at the said election.)

THE CUMBERLAND FALLS PROJECT (S. DOC. NO. 189)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 279, of December 15, 1928, a report on what is known as the Cumberland Falls project, together with other allied projects in that vicinity, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office of withdrawals and restorations of public lands, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

EXPENDITURES, FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the expenditures for the Five Civilized Tribes Agency during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1928, from the appropriations "Support and civilization of Indians, 1927 and 1928," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1928, concerning the appropriations for the construction of rural post roads in cooperation with the States, the Federal administration of that work, and the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national forests, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on receipts and expenditures for the Center Market in the District of Columbia, and on the sale and disposition of useless papers in the Department of Agriculture, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA, GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., ETC.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have no inclination to delay action upon any pending business, but I am under the necessity of leaving the Chamber before the end of the day's session. Before doing so I desire to introduce into the RECORD a statement made yesterday by the Federal Trade Commission regarding the dismissal of the charges against the General Electric Co., the Radio Corporation of America, and others.

I do this without voicing at all any views I may hold regarding a controversial question, but I think in the interest of fairness the Senate should know what has happened after five years of consideration and the taking of 10,000 pages of evidence. Yesterday or day before yesterday the Federal Trade Commission dismissed the charges. This action of the Federal Trade Commission was practically unanimous.

I desire to have inserted at this point in my remarks the release given out yesterday by the Federal Trade Commission relating to this particular matter.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. DILL. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission made a notation to the effect that he concurred in the action of the majority for the reason that the commission was without jurisdiction to make an effective order.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; that is too true. That was his view. In the final vote there was but one dissenting vote. It is a fact and it is a matter of record that the Federal Trade Commission, by a vote of 4 to 1, dismissed the case. I think that fact speaks for itself.

Mr. DILL. The Senator knows that the Federal Trade Commission has no right under the law to continue a case when the facts show that it is without jurisdiction.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no desire, as I said in the beginning, to enter upon any controversy in regard to the matter, but I do think the Senate should be advised as to what action was taken by the Federal Trade Commission. It is a fact, as the Senator from Washington points out, that the case was dismissed.

Mr. DILL. Yes; but I do not want the RECORD to give the impression that it was dismissed because there was no violation of any law of the United States, but rather because it was a violation of the law over which the Federal Trade Commission has no jurisdiction.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask that the RECORD may show the facts as stated in the release issued by the Federal Trade Commission and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and Senators may form their own conclusion as to the merits or demerits of the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New York is granted.

The matter was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

[Immediate release Wednesday, December 19, 1928]

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington.

Dismissal of its complaint against General Electric Co., Radio Corporation of America and others, charging unfair competition in monopolizing the manufacture and sale of radio devices and monopolizing radio communication, was announced to-day by the Federal Trade Commission.

Prior to the commission's decision to-day the last action taken in the case was in June when arguments were heard on motions of respondents to dismiss the complaint because of lack of sufficient proof and because the subject matter of the charges was not in the commission's jurisdiction.

Respondents other than General Electric Co. and the Radio Corporation were: American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Electric Co. (Inc.), Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., the International Radio Telegraph Co., United Fruit Co., and Wireless Specialty Apparatus Co.

Specifically, the complaint charged that respondents combined and conspired with the effect of restraining competition and creating monopoly in the manufacture, purchase, and sale of radio apparatus and other electrical devices and monopolizing radio communication.

Another complaint, under the Clayton Act, in the matter of contracts in connection with the sale of tubes for radio sets, is now pending.

Chairman Myers noted for the record that he concurred in the action of the majority for the reason that the commission was without jurisdiction to enter an effective order.

PETITIONS

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called Porter narcotic bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented numerous petitions, and papers in the nature of petitions, from sundry citizens and civic and religious organizations in the State of Minnesota, praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Eastport, Me., praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEYES presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Club, of Exeter, and the Department Committee of the Department of Women's Work, New Hampshire Congregational Conference, at Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire, favoring the ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of Canyon, Amarillo, Houston, Brady, Rochelle, Port Arthur, Cameron, San

Antonio, Fort Worth, Sherman, Austin, El Paso, and Corsicana, all in the State of Texas, praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the petition of Charles A. Severin-son and 13 other citizens of Fargo, N. Dak., praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Fargo, N. Dak., praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of Lawrence, Kans., praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Women's Bible Class, the Young Woman's Home Missionary Society, the Woman's Relief Corps, the Parent-Teacher Association, the League of Women Voters, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and League of Women Voters, Ladies Auxiliary to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Business and Professional Women's Club, and Betty Bonney Chapter of Daughters of the American Revolution, all of Arkansas City; the Young Women's Christian Association and the board of directors of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Parsons; the Friends Church, College Hill Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sunday School Class of College Hill Methodist Episcopal Church, the Sibbitt Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Kansas Adult Guidance Council of the Young Women's Christian Association, all of Wichita; the Young Women's Christian Association, of Burrton; the Community Young Women's Christian Association of Buhler, the Community Young Women's Christian Association, the Woman's Home Missionary Society, and the Woman's Club, of Haven, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12897) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1356) thereon.

PRINTING OF DATA RELATIVE TO THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution (S. Res. 282), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That certain data and information relating to the Colorado River investigation, water storage, and power development, Grand Canyon of the Imperial Valley, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that to-day that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 4302. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Federal Point Lighthouse Reservation, N. C., to the city of Wilmington, N. C., as a memorial to commemorate the Battle of Fort Fisher; and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution limiting the operation of sections 198 and 203 of title 18 of the Code of Laws of the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5040) to amend the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 5041) granting a pension to Georgia A. Swett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5042) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Tripp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5043) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Harriman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 5044) granting a pension to Clark Huggins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 5045) authorizing Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain from the town of Alburgh, Vt., to the town of Swanton, Vt., the said right and privilege to extend across Lake Champlain along the shore line 1 mile each way, northerly and southerly from the Central Vermont Railway Co.'s bridge on the Swanton shore and 1 mile northerly from said bridge and southerly from said bridge to the south end of McGregors Point, so called, on the Alburgh shore, at a point at or near East Alburgh; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 5046) to relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 5047) to amend section 10 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5048) granting a pension to Annie McKinnie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 5049) granting a pension to A. C. Weatherstone (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Isabell J. Rogers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5051) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5052) for the relief of Edwin Lockwood MacLean; and

A bill (S. 5053) for the relief of Henry G. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 5054) granting a pension to William A. Cox; (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5055) for the relief of De Witt & Shobe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 5056) for the relief of William B. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 5057) granting a pension to Mary Leeder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5058) for the relief of George A. Hormel & Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5059) granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago South Shore & South Bend Railroad to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5060) to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services May 30, 1929; and

A bill (S. 5061) to correct the military record of G. W. Gilkison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5062) granting a pension to Vance K. Stewart;

A bill (S. 5063) granting a pension to Clarence W. Jones;

A bill (S. 5064) granting an increase of pension to Anna P. Vesey; and

A bill (S. 5065) granting a pension to Silas Overmier (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMERICAN TRANSATLANTIC CO.

Mr. BRUCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2364) for the relief of the American Transatlantic Co., a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 56. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue receipts to senders for ordinary mail, of any character, and to fix the fees chargeable therefor;

H. R. 57. An act to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service;

H. R. 6864. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry the mail when tendered;

H. R. 10441. An act to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909;

H. R. 12415. An act to grant freedom of postage in the United States domestic service to the correspondence of the members of the diplomatic corps and consuls of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union, stationed in the United States; and

H. R. 13114. An act to amend section 197 of the Criminal Code (sec. 320, title 18, U. S. C.).

The bill (H. R. 15386) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

JOHN COSTIGAN

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a request for unanimous consent which I think will meet with no opposition. On the 9th of April, 1928, the Senate approved an adverse report on the bill (H. R. 3192) for the relief of John Costigan, and the bill was indefinitely postponed. I now ask unanimous consent to set aside the order indefinitely postponing the bill, and that it may be rereferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is a private bill and it is thought that a mistake has been made about it. I merely wish it to go back to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The order indefinitely postponing the bill will be vacated and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JUDICIAL SALARIES (S. DOC. NO. 188)

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have published as a Senate document the report of the special committee on judicial salaries, submitted at the meeting of the American Bar Association at Seattle, Wash., July 25, 1928.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the matter referred to will be printed as a Senate document.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMOOT. I desire first to get the appropriation bill before the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, just a moment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let the bill be taken up first and then the Senator from Alabama can obtain the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to have the bill taken up before yielding. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered and the amendments of individual Senators to be offered later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a bill which I introduced some time ago to increase the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD allotted to Senators and Members of the House and other Government officials. It has been before the Committee on Printing and unanimously reported. It is now ready for action by the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. If it shall lead to any discussion whatever, I shall have to object.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am sure that it will lead to no debate.

Mr. ASHURST. How many copies does it give us?

Mr. HEFLIN. It gives to Senators 150 copies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Let the title of the bill be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 5022) to amend sections 183 and 184 of chapter 6 of title 44 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1926, relative to the printing and distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what change it makes in existing law.

Mr. HEFLIN. It increases the number of copies allowed to each Senator to 150 and the number of copies allowed to each Member of the House to 100. Each Senator now has only 88 copies for his entire State, and that apportionment was made 35 years ago. The population of the country has greatly increased, and the requests for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been largely augmented.

Mr. SMOOT. What will it cost, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. HEFLIN. It will cost something more, but I am sure that the increased amount will be money well spent.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the extra cost will be over half a million dollars, will it not?

Mr. HEFLIN. The Committee on Printing has worked it all out, and the bill ought to be passed before Christmas, so that we may put the additional RECORDS on our list.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Printing if he has any estimate as to the increased cost which will be involved by the bill?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, it is difficult to say what the increased cost will be, because there will not be 100 copies of the RECORD printed for each Member of the House or 150 for each Senator unless they make the call for them.

Mr. SMOOT. They will undoubtedly make the call.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If they shall do so, there will be involved the extra time for running the presses and extra time for the printers.

Mr. SMOOT. And for the paper and mailing; so that I think it will cost the Government half a million dollars in addition to the present expenditure for this purpose.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I can not be certain as to the additional cost.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past we have appropriated \$485,000 for the number now being distributed. It is proposed by the bill to increase the number considerably, and I am quite sure it will cost over a half a million dollars. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over until I can find out exactly what the additional cost will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Under objection, the bill will go over.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I do not want it to go over until I may make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is objection made to the request for unanimous consent the joint resolution must go over if the objection is persisted in. Does the Senator from Utah persist in his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I will know by to-morrow exactly what the additional cost will be and I think the Senate ought to know as to that before the bill shall be passed.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know of any Senator who would oppose it if he knew what it would cost. We are appropriating millions of dollars to print and send out other literature to the people over the country. They are asking for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that they may know what is going on in Congress, and we are withholding the information from them if we refuse them access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go over. I shall find out what the additional cost will be by to-morrow.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I shall ask on to-morrow that the bill may be taken up and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

FREDERICK D. SWANK

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a few days ago there was entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 584) for the relief of Frederick D. Swank was passed. That motion was adopted and the bill was brought back. The questions involved have been referred to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], who is ill in the hospital, and the claimant, and it has been agreed that some amendments shall be offered to the bill. I take it, therefore, that there will be no objection to reconsidering the bill at this time, and I am willing to have the motion to reconsider put.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the nature of the bill.

Mr. JONES. It is a claim for additional compensation growing out of the raising of a vessel. It was reported by the committee and passed the Senate some days ago, but the changes to which I have referred have been agreed upon between the claimant and the Senator from Nebraska. So I ask that the vote whereby the bill was passed may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. JONES. I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 584) for the relief of Frederick D. Swank.

Mr. JONES. I offer the amendments which have been agreed upon. They are indicated on the bill, on the first page in lead pencil and on the second page in typewriting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 12, after the word "extra," it is proposed to insert the words "time and"; and after the word "services," in the same line, to insert the word "required."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, to strike out all of section 2 of the proposed committee amendment, lines 9 to 24, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

SEC. 2. That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of said Frederick D. Swank against the United States for the reasonable value of all services and materials furnished by him for which the United States is found legally liable under his contract with the United States for the removal of the wreck of the oil tanker *Alden Anderson*, except that there shall be deducted from any such judgment all sums paid prior to the approval of this act to said Frederick D. Swank with respect to such removal. Such claim shall be instituted prior to January 1, 1930. Appeals from any judgment rendered upon such claim shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROCHDALE COOPERATIVE SOCIETY

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, to-morrow is the natal day of the Rochdale Cooperative Society. I give notice that I shall speak briefly to-morrow on that subject.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). The Secretary will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Industrial assistance and advancement," on page 24, line 20, before the word "available," to strike out "only" and insert "immediately," so as to read:

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, \$450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which sum may be used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, and for advances to Indians having irrigable allotments to assist them in the development and cultivation thereof, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That the expenditures for the purposes above set forth shall be under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1935, except in the case of loans on irrigable lands for permanent improvement of said lands, in which the period for repayment may run for not exceeding 20 years in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That \$125,000 shall be immediately available for expenditures for the benefit of the Pima Indians and not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any other one reservation or for the benefit of any other one tribe of Indians:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage," on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

For the construction of a drainage system for lands of the Sac and Fox Indians in Iowa, \$10,000: *Provided*, That said amount, or so much thereof as may be used in the construction of the drainage system, shall be reimbursed to the United States from the proceeds of leases covering the Indian lands benefited by the drainage work, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease such lands for periods not in excess of five years, and the proceeds derived therefrom shall be used for payment of the cost of said work and the balance placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians, to bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum: *Provided further*, That there is hereby created

against such lands a first lien, which lien shall not be enforced during the period that the title to such lands remains in the Indians but that in case of sale of any such lands said lands shall be sold subject to the first lien herein created, and a recital of said lien shall be made in all patents or deeds issued for any lands benefited under the drainage ditch.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education," on page 43, after line 6, to insert:

For repair, improvement, replacement, or construction of additional public-school buildings within Indian reservations in Arizona attended by children of employees of the Indian Service, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 17, after the figures "\$6,400," to strike out "in all, \$92,400" and insert "for warehouse, \$7,000; in all, \$99,400," so as to read:

For support and education of Indian pupils at the following boarding schools in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively:

Fort Mojave, Ariz.: For 250 pupils, \$65,000; for pay of superintendent, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$15,000; for addition to hospital, \$6,000; for lavatory annexes, \$6,400; for warehouse, \$7,000; in all, \$99,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 19, before the word "pupils," to strike out "850" and insert "900"; in line 20, after the word "paper," to strike out "\$212,500" and insert "\$225,000"; and at the end of line 24 to strike out "\$264,500" and insert "\$277,000," so as to read:

Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans.: For 900 pupils, including not to exceed \$1,500 for printing and issuing school paper, \$225,000; for pay of superintendent, drayage, purchase of water for domestic purposes, and general repairs and improvements, including necessary drainage work, \$27,000; for remodeling engineering plant, \$25,000; in all, \$277,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 16, to change the appropriation for Indian boarding schools from "\$3,850,000" to "\$3,869,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Conservation of health," on page 52, line 3, after the word "diseases," to strike out "\$2,646,600" and insert "\$2,718,600," so as to read:

For conservation of health among Indians (except at boarding schools supported from specific appropriations, other than those named herein), including equipment, materials, and supplies; repairs and improvements to buildings and plants; compensation and traveling expenses of officers and employees, and renting of quarters for them when necessary; transportation of patients and attendants to and from hospitals and sanatoria; returning to their former homes and interring the remains of deceased patients; not exceeding \$3,000 for expenses (not membership fees) of physicians and nurses when officially detailed, in the interest of health work among the Indians, to attend meetings of medical and health associations; and not exceeding \$1,000 for circulars and pamphlets for use in preventing and suppressing trachoma and other contagious and infectious diseases, \$2,718,600, including not to exceed the sum of \$1,508,100 for the following-named hospitals and sanatoria.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at this time I am instructed by the committee to offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,508,100" and to insert "\$1,520,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 54, line 1, after the name "Shawnee Sanatorium," to strike out "\$48,000" and insert "\$60,000," so as to read:

Oklahoma: Cheyenne and Arapahoe Hospital, \$25,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw Hospital, \$45,000; Shawnee Sanatorium, \$60,000; Claremore Hospital, \$25,000; Seger Hospital, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 23, after the figures "\$50,000," to insert "for construction of an addition to the hospital building, including refrigerating and other equipment; for employees' quarters; and for general repairs and improvements at the Kiowa Hospital, Lawton, Okla., \$60,000"; and on page 55, at the end of line 6, to strike out "\$515,000" and insert "\$575,000," so as to read:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for construction of hospitals and sanatoria, including equipment, as follows: Colorado River Hospital and physician's cottage, Arizona, \$50,000;

Oraibi Sanatorium, Arizona, \$65,000; Fort Belknap Hospital, Montana, \$50,000; Tongue River Hospital, Montana, \$55,000, including water and sewer systems in connection therewith; Turtle Mountain Hospital, North Dakota, \$50,000; for construction of an addition to the hospital building, including refrigerating and other equipment; for employees' quarters; and for general repairs and improvements at the Kiowa Hospital, Lawton, Okla., \$60,000; Pawnee and Ponca Hospital, Oklahoma, \$60,000; Pine Ridge Hospital, South Dakota, \$65,000; Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Sanatorium, South Dakota, \$70,000; Hayward Hospital, Wisconsin, \$50,000; in all, \$575,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 15, to strike out:

For construction of an addition to the hospital building, including refrigerating and other equipment; for employees' quarters; and for general repairs and improvements at the Kiowa Hospital, Lawton, Okla., \$60,000, payable from funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians of Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration," on page 56, line 17, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$925,000" and insert "\$985,000," so as to read:

For general support of Indians and administration of Indian property, including pay of employees, \$985,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress on the first Monday of December, 1930, by the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes through the Secretary of the Interior showing in detail the expenditure of all moneys from this appropriation on behalf of the said Five Civilized Tribes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 23, after the name "Five Civilized Tribes," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the position of Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes is hereby included within the competitive classified civil service and shall be subject to civil service laws and rules.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the language proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That the position of Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes is hereby included within the competitive classified civil service and shall be subject to civil service laws and rules.

Before the Senate adopts the committee amendment I think a statement should be made as to just what the effect of that action would be.

I was a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs in 1914 when this position was created. A provision contained in an act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs approved August 1, 1914, read as follows:

Provided, That effective September 1, 1914, the offices of the Commissioner of the Five Civilized Tribes and Superintendent of Union Agency, in Oklahoma, be, and the same are hereby, abolished, and in lieu thereof there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, with his office located in the State of Oklahoma, at a salary of \$5,000 per annum, and said superintendent shall exercise the authority and perform the duties now exercised by the Commissioner to the Five Civilized Tribes and the Superintendent of the Union Agency, with authority to reorganize the department and to eliminate all unnecessary clerks, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Objection is made to the inclusion of an item in a general appropriation bill abolishing the office of Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes. I beg to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that the office was created by an item in a general appropriation bill. Anything that could be done in that matter can be properly undone in the same manner.

One reason urged for consolidating the two then existing offices, and establishing one official to perform the duties of both as Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, was that there were many matters of a minor nature which should not be referred to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington—matters that could be better disposed of in Oklahoma. In was, therefore, recommended that this position be created, that a salary of \$5,000 per annum be attached thereto, and that the official thus appointed should be confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

In a subsequent Indian appropriation act his jurisdiction was enlarged. I read from a proviso:

That hereafter no undisputed claims to be paid from individual moneys of restricted allottees, or their heirs, or uncontested agricul-

tural and mineral leases (excluding oil and gas leases) made by individual restricted Indian allottees, or their heirs, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, but all such undisputed claims or uncontested leases (except oil and gas leases) heretofore required to be approved under existing law by the Secretary of the Interior shall hereafter be paid, approved, rejected, or disapproved by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma.

I favored the enactment of that legislation, and would have given the superintendent even more authority. Under authority of the law creating this office there was appointed a most excellent gentleman, Mr. Gabe E. Parker, who served for nearly eight years in that office without scandal of any kind. Mr. Parker came up from the Indian Service. He was a man thoroughly familiar with the administration of Indian affairs, and his administration of the office was entirely satisfactory. Nevertheless, it was a political appointment made under an item in the Indian appropriation bill which changed it from a civil-service position to a political appointment.

However, subsequent political appointees have not conducted themselves in so satisfactory a manner. We have the testimony of Mr. Meritt, the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the effect that one superintendent, Mr. Victor Locke, was removed from office for misconduct; that his successor, Mr. Shade E. Wallen, was likewise removed and was indicted by a grand jury for irregularities in the conduct of that office. It is, therefore, highly desirable to restore the original status. It seems to me it is entirely proper to do that on a general appropriation bill, inasmuch as the original position was created in that manner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the President appointed a civil-service employee who now holds the place?

Mr. HAYDEN. The acting superintendent, Mr. Charles S. Ellis, who is a civil-service employee, has been in charge of the office, so I am informed, for the past two years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the President send his appointment in to the Senate or not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know. I imagine not.

Mr. McKELLAR. The President has the right to do that if he desires, has he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. There is no dispute about that; but that has not been done.

I hold in my hand the Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1926. That board is made up of 10 distinguished citizens of the United States, whose names are as follows:

Warren K. Moorhead, Andover, Mass.; Samuel A. Eliot, Boston, Mass.; Frank Knox, Manchester, N. H.; Daniel Smiley, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.; Malcolm McDowell, Washington, D. C.; Gen. Hugh L. Scott, Princeton, N. J.; Clement S. Ucker, Savannah, Ga.; Flora Warren Seymour, Chicago, Ill.; John J. Sullivan, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary Vaux Walcott, Washington, D. C.

The members of this board serve without pay, and their point of view is entirely disinterested.

In the report of this board for the year 1924 I find this statement in respect to the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes:

CIVIL-SERVICE STATUS FOR SUPERINTENDENT

The Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes is the only superintendent in the Indian Service who has not a civil-service status. He is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, by virtue of an act of Congress approved in 1914. All other reservation superintendents are appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under civil service laws and regulations. Before 1914 this jurisdiction was ably managed by two officials appointed in conformity with the civil service law, and under them the great task of allotment and organization was practically completed.

It is quite evident that the radical change in the status of the superintending official was effected 12 years ago as a matter of political expediency. There were no unusual conditions existent at the time which required the setting apart of this agency as a unique exception to the long-established and time-tested practice that placed the field management of Indian affairs in the hands of civil-service employees. There then were a number of competent, experienced field officials having the civil-service status—as there are now—any one of whom could have effectively superintended the agency for the Five Civilized Tribes.

This office is frankly regarded as a rightful perquisite of the political party in power. No other superintendency is so regarded. There is no valid reason why the Five Civilized Tribes superintendent should be unique in this respect. It certainly is a sad commentary on our vaunted American civilization that the happiness, welfare, and progress of sev-

eral thousands of human beings, who happen to be the Indian wards of a great Government, should be made secondary to the political fortunes of a few white persons who happen to live in Oklahoma.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from what document he reads?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am reading from the Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners for the Year Ending June 30, 1926. [Reading:]

For the past 12 years, no matter which of the major parties were in power, and irrespective of the personality of the incumbent of this office, there has been a constant atmosphere of suspicion, of charge and countercharge, of factional jockeying, of favoritism and discrimination surrounding the office of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes. The incumbent not only has been subjected to attacks from the party in opposition but also by the faction of his own party to which he did not belong and which vehemently wanted to get him out in order to get its man in.

If these political maneuverings did not affect the Indians, this matter perhaps might be passed over as of minor consequence. But the injection of practical politics into the administration of the affairs of this group of tribes has been most injurious to the welfare of the Indians and has brought discredit to the Nation and the State of Oklahoma.

The sole cure for this evil situation is the repeal of the law which changed the office of superintendent from a civil-service status, making it a political appointment.

Such action would make this office similar in all respects to that of other superintendencies in the Indian Service. Whenever this suggestion has been offered it was promptly met by the argument that the great importance of this superintendency, the large number of its Indian population, and the vast wealth evidenced by their valuable land properties made it necessary to have a superintendent who was appointed by the President.

That argument no longer has any force, if it ever had any. As a matter of fact this agency has lost the standing it once held as the most important superintendency in the Indian Service. Its present apparent importance is due to the presence of some opulent Indian estates owned by less than 5 per cent of the total enrolled restricted Indians. By placing these estates in the charge of trustee banks and trust companies, as we are recommending, the population, financial, and land-holding statistics of this agency would dwindle down to those of a fair-sized jurisdiction.

We are recommending that the agency be subdivided into two jurisdictions, each with a civil-service superintendent. The natural division would seem to group the Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole, with a population of restricted enrolled allottees of about 11,000 or more, into one jurisdiction, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw, with a population of restricted enrolled allottees of about 5,000, into another.

Quite recently, at your request, the President, by an Executive order, placed all employees of the tribal school in this agency under the civil service. We beg to urge you to do what you properly can do to secure legislation which will enable you to subdivide the agency for the Five Civilized Tribes into two or more Indian Service units, in your discretion, with superintendents and all employees having a civil-service status.

That, Mr. President, is the recommendation of the Board of Indian Commissioners. I want to follow it by reading a brief letter from the representative of the Indian Rights Association addressed to me, dated to-day, as follows:

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION (INC.),
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1928.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: We have consistently and continuously urged that the selection and appointment of the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma should be within the competitive classified civil service. This legislation is most desirable so as to remove as far as possible the management of our Indian wards from the evils resulting through political favoritism.

We trust you will lend your support to the provision in the pending act providing for appropriations for the Interior Department, which includes the provision that the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes shall be included within the classified civil service.

Very cordially yours,

S. M. BROSIUS,
Representative Indian Rights Association.

I shall detain the Senate but a moment longer, and to direct attention to the planks in the platforms of the two great political parties adopted this year on the subject "Civil service." The Democratic platform reads:

CIVIL SERVICE

Grover Cleveland made the extension of the merit system a tenet of our political faith. We shall preserve and maintain the civil service.

The Republican national platform reads, under the heading "Civil service":

The merit system in Government service originated with and has been developed by the Republican Party. The great majority of our public-service employees are now secured through and maintained in the Government-service rules. Steps have already been taken by the Republican Congress to make the service more attractive as to wages and retirement privileges, and we commend what has been done as a step in the right direction.

The next step to take, so far as the Indian Service is concerned, is presented to the Senate by the House provision in the pending bill, which provides that the position of Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes shall be in the classified civil service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the word "Indians," to strike out the semicolon and the following: "for the construction of a drainage system for lands of the Sac and Fox Indians in Iowa, \$10,000: *Provided*, That said amount or so much thereof as may be used in the construction of the drainage system shall be reimbursed to the United States from the proceeds of leases covering the Indian lands benefited by the drainage work, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease such lands for periods not in excess of five years, and the proceeds derived therefrom shall be used for payment of the cost of said work and the balance placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians, to bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum: *Provided further*, That there is hereby created against such lands a first lien which lien shall not be enforced during the period that the title to such lands remains in the Indians, but that in case of sale of any such lands said lands shall be sold subject to the first lien herein created, and a recital of said lien shall be made in all patents or deeds issued for any lands benefited under the drainage ditch; in all, \$10,600;" so as to read:

Iowa: Sac and Fox, \$600: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of taxes on any lands held in trust by the United States for the benefit of said Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 21, after the figures "\$3,000," to strike out "Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache, \$60,000"; and at the end of line 23, to strike out "\$84,600" and insert "\$24,600," so as to read:

Oklahoma: Ponca, \$1,200; Ponca, \$2,600; Tonkawa, \$700, \$4,500; Sac and Fox, \$3,000; Cheyennes and Arapahoes, \$17,100; in all, \$24,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, at the end of line 24, to change the total appropriation for general support and administration of Indian affairs from "\$1,447,550" to "\$1,387,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 79, line 5, after the word "construction," to strike out "\$213,000; in all, \$233,000" and insert "\$500,000; in all, \$520,000," so as to read:

Sun River project, Montana: For operation and maintenance, \$20,000; continuation of construction, \$500,000; in all, \$520,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 9, after the word "appropriated," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That on or before July 1, 1929, notice shall be given by the Secretary of the Interior requiring the water users to assume the control of the constructed works on January 1, 1931, and to commence payment of construction charges in accordance with the contract of June 22, 1928, between the United States and the Greenfields irrigation district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 22, to insert:

Newlands project, Nevada: That such portion as may be necessary of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$50,000 for the survey and examination of water storage reservoir sites on the headwaters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, made available under the provisions of the second deficiency act, 1928 (Public, No. 563, Session Laws, 1st sess. 70th Cong., p. 902, Newlands project, Nevada), shall also be available for the boring of test wells in the Truckee Meadows, Washoe County, near the city of Reno, Nev.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 6, after the figures "\$6,000," to insert: "Continuation of construction, \$644,000, of

which amount not more than \$130,000 shall be available for the purchase of a proportionate interest in the existing storage reservoir of the Warm Springs project; in all, \$650,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$744,000 for the continuation of construction for the fiscal year 1929 shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930," so as to read:

Vale project, Oregon: For operation and maintenance, \$6,000; continuation of construction, \$644,000, of which amount not more than \$130,000 shall be available for the purchase of a proportionate interest in the existing storage reservoir of the Warm Springs project; in all, \$650,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$744,000 for the continuation of construction for the fiscal year 1929 shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 9, after the name "Washington," to strike out "For operation and maintenance, \$20,000; for continuation of construction, \$862,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of \$138,000 of the appropriation of \$1,500,000 contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929 (45 Stat. p. 277), shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930 for such continuation of construction; in all, \$882,000" and in lieu thereof to insert: "For continuation of construction and operation and maintenance, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$1,500,000 contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929 (45 Stat. p. 227) shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930," so as to read:

Yakima project (Kittitas division), Washington: For continuation of construction and operation and maintenance, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$1,500,000 contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929 (45 Stat. p. 227) shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 7, to increase the total appropriation from the reclamation fund from \$7,211,000 to \$8,760,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey—General expenses," on page 88, after line 7, to insert:

For a topographic survey of the boundaries of the proposed Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia, for expenditure by the Geological Survey under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the computation and adjustment of control data; the office drafting and publication of the resulting maps; the purchase of equipment, not to exceed \$700 for the purchase and not to exceed \$1,000 for the hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for field use; and for the securing of such aerial photographs as are needed to make the field surveys, to be immediately available, \$45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "\$165,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to read:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, \$225,000; for operation and maintenance of the Lees Ferry, Ariz., gauging station and other base-gauging stations in the Colorado River drainage, \$50,000; in all, \$275,000, of which amount not to exceed \$90,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in cooperation with States or municipalities except upon the basis of the State or municipality bearing all of the expense incident thereto in excess of such an amount as is necessary for the Geological Survey to perform its share of general water-resource investigations, such share of the Geological Survey in no case exceeding 50 per cent: *Provided further*, That \$150,000 of this amount shall be available only for such cooperation with States or municipalities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, at the end of line 25, to change the total appropriation for United States Geological Survey from \$2,040,800 to \$2,085,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 94, line 9, after the word "improvements," to strike out "\$31,400" and insert "\$37,400"; in line 12, after the word "mechanic," to insert "\$6,000 for a residence for the United States Commissioner"; and at the end of line 18, to

strike out "\$214,400" and insert "\$220,400," so as to make the paragraph read:

Glacier National Park, Mont.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and the international boundary, including not exceeding \$800 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, including \$15,000 for fire prevention, \$183,000; for construction of physical improvements, \$37,400, including not exceeding \$13,860 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$3,235 shall be available for a residence for the chief mechanic, \$6,000 for a residence for the United States commissioner, \$4,055 for fire caches and three fire lookout towers, \$310 for the completion of a bunk house, \$200 for the completion of a mess house, \$600 for the completion of a duplex cottage, and \$10,350 for one-third of the cost of constructing a telephone line partly outside the park boundary; in all, \$220,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, after the figures "\$412,360," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$65,000 for the construction of water supply and camp-ground facilities at Glacier Point contained in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929 shall remain available until June 30, 1930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 14, after the word "monuments," to strike out "by purchase, or by condemnation under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (U. S. C. p. 1302, sec. 257), whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior acquisition by condemnation proceedings is necessary or advantageous to the Government," so as to read:

For the acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber within the boundaries of existing national parks and national monuments, \$250,000, to be expended only when matched by equal amounts by donation from other sources for the same purpose, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber in the existing national parks and national monuments not exceeding a total of \$2,750,000 as matching funds from outside sources are donated for the same purpose, and his action in so doing shall be considered contractual obligations of the Federal Government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill whether the words "by purchase" in line 14 should not be left. Is there not a little more excised there than is necessary to be excised?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee thought not. The committee thought that that should be, "For the acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber within the boundaries of existing national parks and national monuments, \$250,000."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator has not caught the point I am making. I take it that the committee simply wanted to take away the right to condemn under this, leaving the right to purchase.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under existing law. That is the idea; that we just leave the law as it is. That is the argument that was made.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That does not help the situation. As this stands now, it is for the acquisition of these lands, and that would permit the acquisition in any way by which they can be acquired under the law, if we appropriate this money.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They can acquire these lands either by purchase or by condemnation. That is not what the committee intended to do. They intended to give the power to get the lands by purchase, but did not intend to make any appropriation so that they could use it for condemning the land.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the decision of the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, then this becomes a most serious matter, and I shall be obliged to take some time in discussing it. I can not think that the committee intended anything of the kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understood it to be stated by one of the Senators, the junior Senator from Montana, that this land could be purchased, but that if for any reason it could not be purchased at a reasonable price, then the department would have the right to condemn under existing law.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it was argued further than that. It was stated before the committee that the department itself was

in very grave doubt about whether it had the right now to condemn in such cases as this, and it was said that it had not exercised that right in any such case. It was assumed by the committee—it was by me, at any rate—that under those circumstances it would not proceed to condemnation because the alleged law under which they might condemn had been in force since 1883, I think—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Eighteen hundred and eighty-eight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since 1888; so that under those circumstances the committee just took out the word "acquisition."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is the situation, if I may be permitted to give my view about the matter: The law of 1888 authorized the condemnation of land desired by the Government for any particular purpose, but there is no appropriation. They may go on and institute proceedings to condemn if they desire to do so, but if they did condemn there would be no money appropriated by which they could pay the price fixed in the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be taken care of at the next session of Congress.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let it be taken care of at the next session of Congress then.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the Senator from Tennessee has stated the exact position the committee took, but if the Senator desires we will amend the amendment by leaving in the words "by purchase."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Leave in the words "by purchase."

Mr. SMOOT. And let it go to conference. Then the whole thing will be in conference.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move, then, to amend the amendment of the committee by restoring the words "by purchase" in line 14.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 5, after the word "boundary," to insert "and for the continuance of construction of the transmountain road in said Glacier National Park," so as to read:

Construction, etc., of roads and trails: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and the international boundary, and for the continuance of construction of the transmountain road in said Glacier National Park, and the Grand Canyon Highway from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park as authorized by the act approved June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. p. 423), and including that part of the Wawona Road in the Sierra National Forest between the Yosemite National Park boundary 2 miles north of Wawona and the park boundary near the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees, and that part of the Yakima Park Highway between the Mount Rainier National Park boundary and connecting with the Cayuse Pass State Highway, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, which includes \$4,000,000, the amount of the contractual authorization contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929, approved March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. pp. 237, 238).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the committee has two other amendments. In behalf of the committee, I send to the desk the following amendment:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 20, after the word "practicable," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided also, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, nurses, and other hospital employees, and stockmen provided for in this act shall not be included within the limitations on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., p. 692, sec. 58).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer also the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, line 3, after the word "prescribe," to insert a comma and "but formal contracts shall not be required, for compliance with section 3744 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., p. 1310, sec. 16), for payment of tuition of

Indian children in public schools or of Indian children in schools for the deaf and dumb, blind, or mentally deficient."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I also offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 119, line 17, after the name "Secretary of the Interior," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the practice of allowing quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to the superintendent and other employees who are required to live at St. Elizabeths Hospital may be continued without deduction from their salary, notwithstanding the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 193).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the following committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, line 24, after the figures "\$25,000," add the following:

For the construction of a new dormitory and gymnasium for girls, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I also offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the amendment just adopted add the following:

For purchase of additional lands, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the totals be corrected by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will be instructed to correct the totals.

Mr. SMOOT. That completes all committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in the Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, are we about to vote on the passage of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; unless the Senator has an amendment to offer.

Mr. McMASTER. I want to ask a question as to page 54, line 5, the provision for the Rapid City Sanatorium School, \$94,600. What does that mean?

Mr. SMOOT. It means that in South Dakota the Crow Creek Hospital will get \$10,000, the Pine Ridge Hospital \$14,000, the Rosebud Hospital \$20,000, and the Rapid City Sanatorium School \$94,600.

Mr. McMASTER. Has there not been a new policy inaugurated in reference to that school? The Rapid City School is an Indian school, but there is no sanatorium there.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true. It was recommended by the department that we change it to a sanatorium school. The Senator will remember the same question arose a year ago. I do not think there is any objection to it. I have not heard any objection on the part of anybody.

Mr. McMASTER. I wish to say that this inaugurates a new policy there in reference to the Rapid City Indian School; that is, it converts it into an institution for tubercular patients.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it seems to me the time ought to have passed when the Federal Government should seize upon some old school building for the purpose of constructing a sanatorium. There are 600 or 700 tubercular Indian children in the State of South Dakota. The purpose of the amendment, as I understand it, is to house and school those children. It seems to me where there is a population of six or seven hundred Indian children who are afflicted with that disease, we having a total Indian population of 25,000, they ought to have the best modern-equipped institution that can be given to them. The only way to cure a tubercular trouble is through sunshine and fresh air. These buildings ought to be constructed with that idea in mind. Taking these six or seven hundred children who are afflicted with tuberculosis and housing them in these old buildings at Rapid City is simply condemning them to death, and it is certainly doing hardly anything to alleviate the trouble.

I am not criticizing the committee, but I am criticizing the policy of treating the Indians in this manner. It seems that in many of the States wherever there has been an old military fort or post, we have gone and taken the stables and old build-

ings and converted them into hospitals and schools for Indians. We have hardly given the Indians any consideration in the days gone by. We have merely utilized every old building possible for the purpose of schools and hospitals for the Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to read to the Senator just what Mr. Meritt said on this question. It was upon this basis that we acted, first in the House and later in the Senate. In speaking of the convenience of the situation Mr. Meritt said:

The item would read "Rapid City, S. Dak., for sanatorium school, \$94,600." We want to convert that into a sanatorium school because we have between 500 and 700 children of school age in the State of South Dakota alone who are not in school, but who either have been returned to their homes from schools because they have tuberculosis, or who have not been received in schools because of tuberculosis. I visited that State this summer, and visited every agency and every school in the State of South Dakota. I was somewhat alarmed about the tuberculosis situation in that State. Practically every superintendent told me that tuberculosis was on the increase because of an epidemic they had there a few years ago, and they were not able to control tuberculosis with the present facilities. It is not fair to those tubercular children to keep them in the average Indian home, which is a miserable affair, without sanitary conditions. A child in those homes does not receive proper shelter, proper food, proper clothing, or proper medical attention. In a school of this kind they would receive all those things and more. They would have the opportunity of recovering their health. It is one of the serious needs of South Dakota. I made this recommendation to Commissioner Burke after my return from my trip there this summer, and he approves the recommendation.

Mr. McMASTER. Everything that the Senator has read from the statement made by Mr. Meritt is absolutely correct. There is a pressing need for an institution of that kind. The State of South Dakota for its own people has an institution located in this vicinity because of the ideal location, the mountain location, air, water, and so on. It is conducive to the curing of tubercular troubles. But when the State of South Dakota built its institution it did not take some old school buildings for the purpose. It constructed new buildings that were properly ventilated and properly lighted so the patients could have the benefit of the sunshine and fresh air. What I am objecting to is that to meet a pressing need by taking old buildings for the purpose instead of constructing new buildings is not in the interest of the welfare of the Indians. Instead of taking an old building and attempting to reconstruct it or refit it, such institutions ought to be new construction and modernly equipped in every way.

Mr. SMOOT. For the satisfaction of the Senator I want to read the following from Mr. Meritt's statement so as to show what the department has in mind:

We are starting this sanatorium school in a modest way for the first year and we hope to get materially increased appropriations for the remodeling and enlargement of the plant. As stated in the hearings we hope ultimately to make this an institution of 500 capacity, because we now have between 500 and 700 children in South Dakota of school age who have tuberculosis and who are in their homes, transmitting the disease to other members of their family.

In other words, this is only the beginning. The Bureau of Indian Affairs recognize that this is not enough.

Mr. McMASTER. I realize that, but does not the Senator think that the way to begin anything like that is to begin at the bottom and not to begin by housing tubercular patients in old school buildings?

Mr. SMOOT. This is a decided improvement over what they have had.

Mr. McMASTER. Certainly it is going to be a decided improvement. What objection would the committee have to changing that wording a little in this paragraph and giving the \$94,600 for the Indian school alone and \$300,000 for the sanatorium and starting them out right?

Mr. SMOOT. That was not considered by the committee.

Mr. McMASTER. But the Senator will agree with me that that is the proper way to begin an institution of that kind. We ought to begin building from the bottom, and we ought not to house these tubercular children in an old building.

Mr. McKELLAR. What amendment would the Senator suggest?

Mr. McMASTER. The provision now creates a new institution at Rapid City by converting an old Indian school into a tubercular institution for the housing of 500 or 600 tubercular Indian children. What I want to do is just to change that wording so that we may give \$94,600 to the school and then begin building a real institution for the tubercular children by the appropriation of \$300,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator wants to add \$300,000?

Mr. McMASTER. Yes; to start a new program.

Mr. WARREN. But that can not be done under the rule.

Mr. McMASTER. I am not violating any rule. There is so much money appropriated for a school and a sanatorium. I am simply proposing to segregate the two items.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question involved is that it has not been estimated for and it has not been reported by the committee. If the Senator had come before the committee, perhaps we would have been able to do what he asks and at least let it go to conference. That at least would give notice of the sentiment of the Congress on the question.

Mr. McMASTER. Could not that be inserted now?

Mr. SMOOT. We could change the \$94,600 to \$394,600, and then we can discuss it and have it before us in conference.

Mr. McMASTER. Will not the Senator do that?

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be glad to accept that amendment and let it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, line 5, strike out "\$94,600" and insert "\$394,600."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Edgar B. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, before the Navajo Council at the Leupp Indian School, Arizona, November 12, 1928.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDGAR B. MERITT, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE NAVAJO COUNCIL HELD AT THE LEUPP INDIAN SCHOOL, ARIZONA, NOVEMBER 12, 1928

Members of the Navajo Council, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to call to order the sixth annual session of the Navajo Tribal Council. I bring you greetings from Washington and the best wishes of high officials of the Interior Department, including Hon. Charles H. Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for a successful meeting of this council.

I am sure that I speak the views of all members of this council and the superintendents of the other Navajo jurisdictions in expressing thanks to Superintendent Hunter and the employees of the Leupp Indian school and agency for their kind invitation to hold the Navajo Council at this place and for the splendid arrangements that have been made for our convenience and comfort while here.

We are holding this council for the purpose of meeting you personally and learning direct from you your views on various matters and problems affecting the Navajo jurisdictions and the Navajo people. It is our hope that this will be a constructive and informative meeting so that we may take back to Washington a better conception of the problems of your several jurisdictions and be in a position to render greater service and assistance to the Navajo Indians. We also want this council to be a medium through which you may know what the Government is trying to do for the Navajos and what is possible to be done by the Federal Government. It is also quite desirable for the Navajo Indians to learn what they can do to help themselves.

Since the ratification of the Fort Sumner Treaty of 1868 the Navajo Indians have made remarkable progress along educational and industrial lines and along other lines of human endeavor. At that time there were estimated to be 9,000 Navajo Indians, and there are now approximately 40,000, a gain of 400 per cent. At that time the Navajos owned approximately 25,000 sheep and goats. To-day they are in possession of approximately 1,100,000 sheep and goats, and are recognized as the greatest and most successful sheep raisers of any Indians in the United States.

In 1868 the Navajo Indians owned but a few head of cattle; to-day they own 65,000 head of cattle and about 45,000 horses. Then there were practically no Navajo Indian children in school; to-day there are 4,923 of your children attending school, 3,220 of whom are in schools on the several Navajo reservations, and 1,696 are attending schools off the reservations, principally nonreservation boarding schools supported by the Federal Government. Practically no money was being appropriated at that time for the education of the Navajos; during the fiscal year 1928 the Government expended \$768,599.24 for the education of Navajo children, exclusive of additional expenditures for the education of Navajo children enrolled in Government nonreservation schools. Then only a few thousand dollars was being expended in behalf of the Navajo Indians, but to-day we are expending considerably in excess of \$1,000,000 annually for the benefit of the Indians within the six Navajo jurisdictions, the amount expended during the fiscal year 1928 being \$1,312,678.98.

In 1868 there were no doctors, nurses, or hospitals for the benefit of the Navajo people; to-day we have 13 doctors, 16 nurses, and 10 hospitals and sanatoria, with a total bed capacity of 345, available for the benefit of the Navajos. During the recent past we have constructed new hospitals at Western Navajo, Leupp, Chin Lee, Tohatchi; a 100-bed sanatorium is now being constructed at Fort Defiance; a small hospital

has been remodeled and enlarged at the Toadlena School; the Marsh Pass School has been converted into a tuberculosis sanatorium; and we hope to obtain at the next session of Congress an appropriation for a sanatorium for the benefit of the Hopi and Leupp jurisdictions.

Article 3 of the treaty of 1868 reads as follows:

"The United States agrees to cause to be built, at some point within said reservation, where timber and water may be convenient, the following buildings: A warehouse, to cost not exceeding \$2,500; an agency building for the residence of the agent, not to cost exceeding \$3,000; a carpenter shop and blacksmith shop, not to cost exceeding \$1,000 each; and a schoolhouse and chapel, so soon as a sufficient number of children can be induced to attend school, which shall not cost to exceed \$5,000."

I think you will agree that this program of construction for the Navajo Indians seems insignificant indeed when compared with the many hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been expended in the construction of school buildings, hospitals, and agency quarters within the six jurisdictions covering the Navajo country.

In 1868 there was set aside for the use of the 9,000 Navajos approximately 3,000,000 acres of land in what is now the States of Arizona and New Mexico. Through the persistent efforts of the Indian Bureau this acreage has been gradually increased until to-day the Navajo Indians have in their possession approximately 13,000,000 acres of land. A tribe of 9,000 uneducated and frequently warring Navajos miserably existing in 1868 has increased in number to more than 35,000, a large number of whom are educated and speak the English language. This tribe is now industrious and self-supporting and is occupying in peaceful possession an area of approximately 13,000,000 acres of land, title to which can not be questioned under the law. These same Navajos are now voluntarily sending their children to school, accepting modern medical and hospital facilities, are wearing citizens' clothes, are driving their own automobiles, are able to conduct business on equal terms with their white neighbors, are improving their home conditions, and have secured for themselves a definite place in the social and economic life in the States of Arizona and New Mexico, of which they are full-fledged citizens and are a credit and a distinct asset to their communities, their States, and to their Federal Government.

I have endeavored to make a comparison between conditions existing in 1868 and conditions as they exist to-day with the Navajo Indians, and it is believed that you will all agree that there has been a most remarkable progress. However proud we may be of past splendid accomplishments and growth in population, wealth, improved home conditions, and social status in general, yet we recognize that there are vast opportunities for still further improvement.

Speaking generally of Indians throughout the United States, in 1868 there were 298,528 Indians; seven years ago, at the beginning of Commissioner Burke's administration of Indian affairs, there were 340,838 Indians; to-day, this number has been increased to 355,901.

In 1868 there were 4,713 Indian children attending schools, many of which were conducted by various church organizations; seven years ago this number had been increased to 62,764, and to-day we have an attendance of Indian pupils in schools of 66,958.

Seven years ago the total Indian property was valued at \$716,705,501, and to-day this property is estimated to be worth \$1,648,075,274.

In 1868 there was approximately no money being expended for health work among Indians, and there were no hospitals or sanatoria. At the beginning of the administration of Commissioner Burke seven years ago there was appropriated specifically for health work \$375,000, and there were 81 hospitals and sanatoria. This year the direct appropriation for health work is \$1,440,000 and the number of hospitals and sanatoria have been increased to 92 in actual operation and several more are under construction at the present time.

No record of the death rate among Indians was kept in 1868. According to the census of 1920, the death rate was 29.3 per thousand and to-day it has been reduced to 21.8 per thousand.

In 1868 there were practically no doctors or nurses working among Indians. Seven years ago there were 181 doctors and 106 nurses. This force of employees has been increased over a 7-year period so that we now have 195 doctors and 204 nurses.

In 1868 there was appropriated for the Indian Service \$2,837,907.09; seven years ago the annual appropriations for the Indian Service totaled \$10,042,554.67. For the current fiscal year the annual appropriations amount to \$14,284,509.

In 1868 most of the Indians of the United States were living in tents, hogans, or wickiups, with few permanent homes. To-day there are over 40,000 Indian families living in permanent homes, and during the last year more than 1,000 new permanent homes have been erected, and repairs and improvements have been made to an approximate similar number.

During the administration of Commissioner Burke there have been obtained from the War Department two Army posts which have been converted into Indian boarding schools and are now being used almost exclusively for the education of Navajo Indian children. I refer to the

Theodore Roosevelt School, in Arizona, with an enrollment of 400, and the Charles H. Burke School, in New Mexico, formerly Fort Wingate, with an enrollment of 609.

We plan in the near future, and as soon as appropriations can be obtained from Congress, to increase the capacity of the Western Navajo boarding school from 300 to about 500; we have recently completed the construction of a new day-school plant at Nava, and we hope as soon as funds can be obtained to construct other day-school plants in the Navajo country.

In recent years we have drilled 304 wells in the Navajo country, and 147 of these wells are now in operation furnishing water for domestic and stock purposes for the Navajo Indians. We have also spent considerable money and have been quite successful in increasing the water supply for the Navajo Indians through the development of springs. This work has resulted in increasing the grazing area in the Navajo country. We believe it is also possible, in some communities, to provide additional water through the building of earthen dams. We are spending this year more money than ever before in the development of water for your use, approximately \$100,000 having been authorized for this purpose.

Two years ago the first exclusive trachoma school for Indians in the United States was established at Fort Defiance, and another school has been converted into a trachoma school this fall at the Northern Navajo agency. The trachoma problem in the Navajo country has been given special and vigorous attention in recent years, and many Navajo Indians have been cured of this disease.

We recognize the need for additional land for the 5,000 Navajos now living off the reservation on the public domain, and at the last session of Congress we were successful in procuring an appropriation of \$200,000 for the purchase of lands for those Indians out of tribal funds, with an authorization for the expenditure of an additional million dollars for this same purpose. The item in the second deficiency appropriation act of May 29, 1928, reads as follows:

"For purchase of additional land and water rights for the use and benefit of Indians of the Navajo Tribe (at a total cost not to exceed \$1,200,000, which is hereby authorized), title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Navajo Tribe, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, \$200,000, payable from funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Navajo Tribe: *Provided*, That in purchasing such lands title may be taken, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the surface only."

We are now engaged in negotiating for the purchase of certain lands for the benefit of the Navajo Indians out of the available appropriation.

Under the administration of Commissioner Burke oil leases were approved on the Navajo Reservation, and the first well was brought in on October 1, 1922. Since then there has been produced within the borders of the Navajo Reservation approximately 1,773,203 barrels of oil, with an income to the tribe of approximately \$656,426.71. Last year the income from this source for the benefit of the Navajo Tribe amounted to \$71,511.77. Oil production has been reduced because of overproduction throughout the country and the low price of oil.

We wish to congratulate the Navajo Indians on their cooperation with our local superintendents in partly ridding the range of practically worthless horses that have heretofore been using the grass and water that should be made available for cattle and sheep, thus yielding a larger income to the Indians.

The Navajo Indians have also cooperated closely in helping us to eradicate dourine among your stock.

It is my desire to make this council meeting a constructive and helpful one, and I am taking the liberty of suggesting the following as some of the subjects that should be discussed by members of the council as well as by the representatives of the Government, including your superintendents, who are here to give you information and assistance:

1. Overgrazing in the Navajo country and steps necessary for proper conservation of the range.
2. The question of eventually limiting the number of sheep, horses, goats, and cattle for any one Indian, so that benefits of the range may be more equitably distributed among all Navajos.
3. Further ridding the range of surplus horses so as to provide more range for sheep and cattle.
4. Purchase of additional lands to provide for Navajo Indians now on the public domain.
5. Further water development by reclaiming springs, impounding water by means of earthen dams, and drilling additional wells where other means of developing water are impossible.
6. Best means of providing additional school facilities in the Navajo country, so that young children may be educated near their homes and so that there may be school facilities for every Navajo child of school age.
7. What additional hospitals, sanatoria, physicians, and nurses, and health centers are needed to provide adequate medical facilities for all Navajo Indians.
8. Present status of oil development and suggestions for future development work.

9. Improvement of roads in the Navajo country, what roads are most needed by Indians at this time, and what are most practical methods of building same.

10. Trachoma schools and best methods of handling the trachoma problem in the Navajo country.

11. Tuberculosis among Navajo Indians, facilities needed for meeting situation, and where sanatoria are most needed.

12. Improving home conditions among Navajo Indians and best methods of getting more and better sanitary Indian homes.

13. Best means of improving grade of cattle and sheep owned by Navajo Indians.

14. Sale of Navajo timber and best use of proceeds for benefit of Navajo Indians.

15. The liquor problem in the Navajo country and the best means of controlling same.

16. The dourine problem on the Navajo Reservation and what further steps are necessary to be taken.

17. The returned-student problem on the Navajo Reservation and the best way of finding employment for returned students both on and off the reservation.

This is your council and we want you to discuss frankly not only these questions but any other matters that you may wish to bring up and we want you to make the best possible use of this opportunity.

During the past two years it has been my pleasure to make two visits to the Navajo country, and I have submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs a number of recommendations which have been approved by him, and which we are carrying out as funds become available. I want you to know of the personal interest of Commissioner Burke and myself in the welfare of the Navajo Indians. We in Washington are interested in your problems, sympathetic to your needs, and will cooperate to the limit of our ability and with the funds available to assist you in every way possible.

In conclusion, permit me to say that while the foregoing statements are convincing proof of the progress that has been made in Indian affairs among the Navajo Indians in particular, and among the Indians of the entire country generally, yet I wish to make it perfectly clear that many things need to be done that can not now be done with the limited appropriations available. Instead of the annual appropriations of between twelve and fifteen million dollars now authorized by Congress we need approximately \$25,000,000 per year for several years to come if we are to meet the actual requirements of the situation. We need more doctors, more nurses, more hospitals and sanatoria, more sanatorium schools, better school facilities, and at least \$300 per capita to operate our schools. We need a large reimbursable appropriation to improve bad home conditions among Indians, more money to provide trained women field demonstration agents with social service ideals, to improve home and living conditions. We need more trained agricultural and industrial leaders to teach Indians to make better use of their industrial opportunities. We need more funds to provide a larger variety and better balanced food for our Indian school children, and we need a trained force of well-paid employees to bring the Indians generally to a better realization that, after all, the Indian problem is their problem, and that it is the duty of the Indians of this country to become, by their own efforts, industrious, progressive, self-supporting, and law-abiding citizens of this great Republic.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I want to make a very brief statement at this point. During the last session of Congress I introduced a bill which was passed by the Senate, authorizing an appropriation to build an Indian school on the Turtle Mountain Reservation at Belle Fourche. On that reservation are some 250 Indian children of school age who are not in school and never have been, because there is no school available for them, either on the reservation or off the reservation. There is an urgent need for such a school. The understanding was that instead of the House passing the bill which had been passed by the Senate, the item would be included in the present appropriation bill, but for some reason it was not reached and was left out. I have been assured, however, that an authorization for the appropriation will be made in the deficiency appropriation bill which is to come along later.

Mr. SMOOT. That question was brought to our attention and I understand that is the program to be carried out.

Mr. FRAZIER. For that reason I did not go before the committee to make any protest in regard to putting the item in the present bill, but I shall expect it to be put in the deficiency bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I desire to submit.

I want to say frankly that the amendment is subject to a point of order and, therefore, I desire briefly to explain it before I offer it, because I think when it is understood there will be no possible objection.

In the northwestern part of Nebraska, in an irrigated portion of the State, there is a reclamation project getting its

water from the Pathfinder Dam in Wyoming. Under this ditch is an older ditch known as the Farmers' ditch, put in before the Pathfinder Dam was built. Several years ago the owners of the private ditch made an agreement with the Department of the Interior by which they were to be supplied with storage water which the Government reclamation ditch stored at the Pathfinder Dam. That agreement has been carried out. It means that the Farmers' ditch is to pay to the Government of the United States the stipulated amount provided for in the contract.

There was a piece of the ditch, as I understand it, 9 miles long that was under sort of joint supervision between the Government reclamation ditch and the Farmers' ditch. It needed considerable work on it. It was a sort of connecting ditch, as I understand it. The Farmers' Irrigation Co., the owners of the private ditch, had the necessary machinery and so forth to do the work. The contract between the Government and the Farmers' ditch provided that this kind of work, in this particular place, was to be a 50-50 proposition. Each ditch paid half of the cost of the repairs.

Since the Farmers' ditch had the machinery the Government officials entered into a contract with the privately owned ditch and employed them to do this work, agreeing to pay them one half of the contract price. They had to stand the other half. The work was completed and everything was satisfactory on both sides and there was no question about the facts, as I understand it, but the private ditch owed the Government, of course, for water, and what they undertook to do was to give the Government credit for one-half of the cost of the improvement and pay the Government the balance, assuming that if the Government paid what they owed, then the Farmers' ditch would owe nothing to the Government. In other words, one-half of the cost of the construction was to be borne by one ditch and one-half by the other ditch, but the one ditch that did the work paid what they owed to the Government and kept out one-half of the cost of the improvement.

Mr. SMOOT. Under an agreement?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; under an agreement. The Comptroller General refused to allow that to be done, however.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question between the two States of Wyoming and Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; there is no such question involved. I had my secretary telephone to Doctor Mead, head of the Reclamation Bureau, telling him what I had in the shape of an amendment prepared and asked him if it was true that it was satisfactory to the Reclamation Bureau. He said that it was and that he hoped we would be able to have the item included in this bill. It simply directs the Reclamation Service to give to the Farmers' ditch credit for one-half of the construction.

Mr. SMOOT. If that be the case, we can let it go in.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on this matter, as it is one in which I am very much interested.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. For a great many years water has been provided for that ditch under what was called the Warren law. I disown it, except that I did, on account of a request from the Interior Department, present a bill providing that in the case of farmers' ditches on land which they owned or which they had taken up under claims, when the irrigation project had a surplus it would furnish water at certain figures. So the farmers had no right at all originally to the water of the irrigation system. According to the last information I had, they refused to pay the amount and they were behind to a considerable extent in their payments.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me read to the Senator the summary of facts which I am told are undisputed. If the conferees find that the statements are not correct, of course, they will reject the amendment. I will read the summary, as it is short:

No. 1. The United States—

By the way, I ought to correct what I said a few moments ago. I said then it was a ditch; it was a drain. It was necessary to put in a draining system in order to drain the land under both of these ditches. The Government ditch is here and the private ditch here, and further down is the draining system which drains both of them.

SUMMARY

No. 1. The United States could not successfully have reclaimed interstate division Government lands without the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Nine Mile Drain.

No. 2. The operation and maintenance of this drain by the farmers' irrigation district is under the close supervision and approval of Government representatives and engineers.

No. 3. The Farmers' Irrigation District is not now delinquent in any of its payments to the United States except \$2,376.45—

That is, one-half of the cost of the improvement—

withheld as an offset to the payment due by the United States.

No. 4. No money is to be expended by the United States. The charge off is to be made against the Pathfinder irrigation district construction. (See P. I. D. resolution.)

I have that resolution here.

No. 5. Cases of this kind with the necessary offset payment have been allowed by the board of claims, title 28, paragraph 774.

No. 6. The contract of June 16, 1917, is the only contract with the United States in which section 10 is included, and this has been entirely eliminated by the formulating and execution of a new contract between the parties dated July 15, 1927, so that the authority to offset this amount by charging same to the construction fund of the Pathfinder irrigation district by the United States would not in any way complicate matters or establish a precedent.

No. 7. Double penalty, 6 per cent, 10 per cent, and operation and maintenance during delinquency. See letter to Bureau of Reclamation July 12, 1927.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me for a moment, this has been agreed to by the Government engineers, and it has been agreed to by Doctor Mead and also by the representatives of the Farmers' ditch.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator the statement to that effect?

Mr. NORRIS. I have one statement from all of those interested.

Mr. WARREN. I am asking in a friendly spirit, of course—

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. WARREN. But I should like to know why the Senator delayed until this moment in presenting the matter. Why did he not go before the committee?

Mr. NORRIS. I only got the information this morning.

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection to letting the amendment go in, with the understanding that it may be stricken out later if that course should be deemed wise. I want some information about it. There has been trouble there for some years, and I want to have everything right, as I know the Senator does.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, on page 121, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to credit the Farmers' Irrigation District with the sum of \$2,376.45, as of January 1, 1927, which represents 50 per cent of the expenses incurred by said district in operating and maintaining the Nine Mile Drain from January 1 to June 30, 1926, under contract with said district, dated June 16, 1917, in connection with the North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the proper place to insert the amendment is on page 85, after line 4, because that is the proper heading under which the amendment should come.

Mr. NORRIS. I drew the amendment before I even saw the bill, as a matter of fact. I ask that the amendment be inserted at the place indicated by the Senator from Utah, on page 85, after line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, for the information of the conferees I should like to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, the documents to which I have referred.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not give them to me?

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I will give them to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it not be better to let them go in the RECORD, so that all Senators may read them?

Mr. SMOOT. They are too long for that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I want to say just a word with regard to what has been said by the Senator from Michigan with reference to the census bill. I want to say to the Senator from Washington that there is another reason why I would like to have that bill go over, and that is that I have offered an amendment to it, a very important amendment, bringing many of the census employees within the scope of the Federal classified service. That amendment is now lying on the table.

Mr. JONES. That, of course, will be considered when the bill is up for consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4126) authorizing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to acquire title to land subject to limited rights reserved, and limited rights in land, and authorizing the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital to lease land or existing buildings for limited periods in certain instances, which were, on page 2, line 5, after the word "rights," to insert "but not for business purposes"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "lease," to insert "subject to such approval."

Mr. SACKETT. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPREME COURT BUILDING

Mr. KEYES. Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to present a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEYES. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. 13665) to provide for the submission to the Congress of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the construction of a building for the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. I will say that the bill has been reported unanimously by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, on page 2, section 2, line 16, before the word "for," to strike out "authorized" and insert "acquired," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be known as the "United States Supreme Court Building Commission," and to be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, an associate justice of the United States to be designated by the Supreme Court of the United States, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol. Notwithstanding the expiration of a Congress, any Representative who is a member of the commission, if reelected, shall continue to serve thereon until a successor is selected by the House of Representatives. The Architect of the Capitol shall serve as executive officer of the commission and shall perform such services under this act as the commission may direct.

SEC. 2. The commission is authorized to procure, by contract or otherwise, preliminary plans and estimates of costs for the construction, and the furnishing and equipping, of a suitable building (including approaches, connections with the Capitol power plant, and architectural landscape treatment of the grounds), for the accommodation and exclusive use of the Supreme Court of the United States; such building to be erected upon the site heretofore acquired for that purpose, and such building to be so situated, and the exterior thereof to be of such type of architecture and material, as to harmonize with the present buildings of the Capitol group. The amount to be expended in procuring such plans and estimates shall be determined by the commission, but shall be within the limits of appropriations made therefor, and shall be disbursed by the disbursing officer of the Department of the Interior, under the direction of the executive officer of the commission. The commission shall make a report to the Congress on or before March 1, 1929, including a detailed statement of such plans and estimates of costs.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? Without objection, the bill is passed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I object. I have been trying to get recognition of the Chair in order to say something on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair heard no objection before the bill was put upon its passage.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was trying two or three times to get recognition from the Chair while he was putting the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator ask unanimous consent that the vote whereby the bill was read the third time and passed may be reconsidered? Is there objection to the reconsideration of the votes?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, so as not to establish a precedent here, I wish to say that the Senator from Alabama was trying to get recognition, and I think, as a matter of right, he is entitled to recognition and not by unanimous consent to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair twice asked was there any objection.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not criticizing the Chair. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Alabama; notwithstanding that he was demanding recognition.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no doubt about the fact that the Senator from Alabama was asking for recognition.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Alabama addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes whereby the bill was read the third time and passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of constructing a building in which the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court may have their offices; I think they need offices in which to work, but I do not want to see the Supreme Court moved out of the Capitol. I should like to see the judges continue to sit in the old temple of justice in the Capitol. I think there is so much sentiment attaching to that old court room that the people would like to see the Supreme Court kept there. I do not think Congress ought to go to the expense of erecting a building for a court when we already have such a splendid place in this fine old building. I think the Supreme Court ought to be retained in the Capitol, but I think we ought to have a building for the justices, where they can have their offices and their library and have ample space in which to work. I do not, however, want to see the court itself taken out of the Capitol. I do not see any necessity for it. There is ample room in the Supreme Court room for the trial of all the cases that come before the court and for those who want to attend those trials. They are not overcrowded there. I see no good reason for moving the court and I see many good reasons for keeping it there. I want to ask some Senator familiar with the measure, is it necessary to have the court established at some other place?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that there is no room in the Capitol Building for the Supreme Court of the United States. There is not actually sufficient room for their library.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have stated that I desire they shall have offices for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Nearly every justice of the Supreme Court has a library at home. In fact, they have to do much of their work at home. There is no place but a cubby-hole or two here in the Capitol Building for the Supreme Court of the United States. It would be unthinkable to say that all of their work, in consultation and study and the preparation of opinions, shall be done in a separate office building, that they shall have their library in that building, but that they shall hold court in their present little room in the Capitol. I can not think of any necessity that is more pressing upon the Government than providing a proper place for the Supreme Court of the United States. At present there is no adequate place for people who wish to go into the court room. There are but a few seats there. When there is a hearing, no matter how important it may be, no matter how many people wish to hear the arguments, there are merely a few seats. I pass there whenever the court is in session time and time again, week after week, and month after month and year after year, and see people standing outside the door, blocking the hallway, so that we can hardly get through.

The present court room was ample at the time it was first occupied, but there is not a little justice's court anywhere in any of the States that does not have a larger space than we provide for the Supreme Court of the United States in the Capitol Building.

Of course, I did not agree with some of the ideas as to closing Maryland Avenue and buying the next block to the north and spreading the Supreme Court from the Library to B Street; I thought that was perfectly silly; I thought that there was no necessity for it at all, but in view of the size of the lot which has been purchased, and the character of the building designed, I wish to say to the Senator it will be an honor to America when it shall have been erected.

Mr. HEFLIN. Where is the new building to be erected?

Mr. SMOOT. On the block just north of the Library of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the construction of a building for the Supreme Court has already been authorized by Congress by regular act.

Mr. SMOOT. It has been authorized.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the property itself has already been condemned.

Mr. SMOOT. It has been condemned.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill is merely to authorize the commission to go on—

Mr. SMOOT. Not only has it been condemned but it has been paid for.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has it been paid for?

Mr. SMOOT. It has been paid for; so it seems to me the Senator from Alabama is making a mistake now in calling this bill back. It provides an appropriation of \$10,000 for the purpose of preparing the plans and specifications and providing for advertising for bids for this building.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me again, it may be that the Senator from Alabama will come to the same conclusion about this matter that I have come to in reference to the change of the Senate Chamber. Some time ago we authorized by law a change in the Senate Chamber; and although we were about to let a contract the other day, I am not so sure but that the committee, after very careful consideration will refuse to make any change in the Chamber, and I do not think any change ought to be made in the Chamber.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, I am in favor of having the Senate refuse to make the change.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it has already passed the Senate. The question is whether the committee will let the contract; and I doubt very much whether the committee will let the contract, because apparently there is no necessity for it.

The same air can be obtained in the present Chamber that can be obtained in the new Chamber. The same pure-air service will have to be secured for the new Chamber that is now secured in the House Chamber. The House has already put in its pure-air system; it is working well, and I see no reason for the vast expenditure of money that is involved in the proposed reconstruction of the Senate Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator say the House has put in a pure-air system?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has already put in a pure-air system, and I understand that it is working well.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to go over that way, then.

Mr. SMOOT. Every Member of the House that I have spoken to about it says that the system is almost perfect. The air is washed before ever it goes into the Chamber; it is taken to the top of the Chamber; it is forced down through the Chamber; it escapes out of the exhaust just as soon as it is breathed.

Mr. HEFLIN. The air that we get here should be washed and we should get more of it.

Mr. SMOOT. We will when we get that system put in.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think possibly it is because there is so much hot air used in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will not seek to recall the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am not going to hold up the passage of this bill; but I desire to state my opposition to moving the Supreme Court out of the Capitol. I think it ought to be kept here. If it is necessary for the Senate to take any action to recall a portion of the bill that it has enacted, I will support it, and stop the construction of a court building separate and apart from the Capitol.

The tourists of the Nation who come here come over to the Senate and view this body in action; they go by and see the Supreme Court, and then over to the House of Representatives, all in the great Capitol of the Nation. Now you are going to move out the Supreme Court and put it off over here in a building to itself, separate and apart from the Capitol, removing one of the ancient landmarks of the Capitol; and I do not see

any good reason for it. It is going to cost money, and we do not need the space.

The Senator from Utah says that he does not know a justice of the peace who has not more room than the Supreme Court have out yonder. I never have seen a justice of the peace holding court in such palatial quarters as they have there.

Mr. McKELLAR. At all events, the Senate of the United States occupied that chamber for about 50 years.

I want to say to the Senator from Alabama that I do not want him to be misled. If the Senator wants further time to look into the matter he had better object to this bill, because if this bill passes it gives this commission authority to enter into the contract; and so it depends on this bill. If the Senator wants further time to consider the matter, he ought to object to this bill. It will not do for him to make the request hereafter.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me say to the Senator that it is true that people visit the Capitol and go from here over to the House and pass the door of the Supreme Court. It is also true that nearly everyone who comes to Washington as a visitor visits the Congressional Library, one of the most magnificent buildings in the world. Every American is proud that there is such a building. When they go there they will see, across the street, the Supreme Court, a most beautiful building, and they will go in there; and every American's heart will be filled with pride to know that the United States Supreme Court—the greatest body in the world for the administration of law—is housed in a building that will do honor to any country in the world, I do not care what country it is.

I am sure that after that building is erected and completed the Senator from Alabama himself will be just as proud as any other American citizen that it is done.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as I said before, I am in hearty agreement with the program to build offices for the Supreme Court justices. I think they ought to have rooms for their libraries, and each one of them ought to have all the space he needs to enable him to carry on his work efficiently and conveniently. Personally, however, I do not think the Supreme Court ought to be moved out of the Capitol. I think money is being expended for that purpose that should be saved by the Government; but I do not seem to have any support from the other Senators on the matter of rescinding action so far as the construction of a building for the court outside the Capitol is concerned, and therefore I will not interpose any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

ORLA W. ROBINSON

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill on the calendar, H. R. 7324, for the relief of Orla W. Robinson.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Orla W. Robinson, who was a member of Company L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, which later became the Thirty-third Company, Coast Artillery, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a corporal of that organization on the 9th day of May, 1901: Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator make a statement about the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is a bill to correct the military record of Orla W. Robinson. Mr. Robinson enlisted in the Spanish-American War and served through an entire enlistment. Later he enlisted again in the Army and served for over two years. While on guard one night at an Army supply station some small articles of property were stolen, and he was charged with the theft of these articles. Rather than, as they say in the Army, "squeal" on somebody else he simply accepted punishment, which was meted out to him in the form of a dishonorable discharge. He was not imprisoned or punished in any way, except that he was given a dishonorable discharge. Later on he enlisted in the Marine Corps and served four years in the Marine Corps with distinction and honor, and was given an honorable discharge.

Mr. Robinson is a citizen of the highest integrity and one of the best citizens of the community. He is a Methodist preacher, and his record, I think, according to the statements I have received and the information I have, ought to be corrected. It is simply a case where he suffered punishment rather than tell on somebody else.

The House Committee on Military Affairs investigated the matter and reported the bill unanimously, the House passed it in the same way, and the Senate committee has reported it here. I think the bill ought to be passed, and I should like to have it passed before Christmas.

Mr. KING. I suppose the primary purpose is to get a pension for this man?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir; it is not. It is simply to correct his record.

Mr. KING. That will be one of the results, however.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. Of course, I can not guarantee that; but that is not the object of the bill. This man does not need a pension. He does not intend to ask for one, but he simply does not want dishonor to remain against his record.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether there was any special reason why this soldier should sacrifice himself for the sake of another soldier?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not know of any. The Senator is familiar with the fact that frequently in the Army and in college life there is a spirit of that sort which impels men to keep silent rather than to tell the truth on others.

Mr. BRUCE. Does any such disposition exist to such an extent that a man will permit himself to be set down as a thief when he is not guilty of the theft at all, and some one else is?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure that that feeling would go to that extent in most cases; but it seems to have been the motive in this case.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask just as a matter of curiosity.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was no special reason.

Mr. BRUCE. All the Senator states is that this soldier was charged with a theft, and that rather than let a person who was really guilty suffer the just measure of punishment, he, without having any special motive at all for his generous altruism, arising out of relationship or the like, allowed himself to be placed in the category of a thief. That sounds to me rather improbable.

Mr. BARKLEY. The testimony of his comrades, in the form of affidavits which were filed with the committee in the House, and the report of the House committee on this measure show that he is just the type of man who would do that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky use his good offices to get this preacher to write fully to our friend from Maryland?

Mr. BRUCE. No; it may not be necessary. I want to know the nature of the affidavits. I believe the pension roll should be a roll of honor; and because of that conviction I paid quite a penalty here a year ago, when I was made the subject of the grossest misrepresentations and of mendacious slanders because I insisted that a soldier who had been court-martialed for a theft and had been imprisoned for some nine months and dishonorably discharged from the Army should not be placed on the pension roll along with honorable pensioners.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that this verdict carried with it no punishment. There was no punishment inflicted; and that in itself shows that there must have been doubt of his guilt in the minds of the members of the court-martial. He was simply dishonorably discharged.

Mr. BRUCE. What was the article that was stolen?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, just a few trivial articles from the supply station; and he happened to be on guard at the time they were taken. This bill is not offered for the purpose of obtaining any pension. The man is an honorable man. He is a man of integrity. He stands well. He simply desires to have his record corrected.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes, I know; and I suppose he feels that he gave proper evidence of repentance by becoming a Methodist minister afterwards. What I want to find out is the nature of these affidavits which were deemed by the committee to be sufficiently exculpatory in character to justify placing this man on the pension roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator seems to emphasize the pension feature of the bill. I will say to him again that while probably incidentally the man might have the right to apply for a pension, that is not the object of this bill. It would only follow incidentally.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I know; but my observation has been that when the record of a soldier is corrected under these circumstances and he is reinstated an application for pension follows as a matter of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily; and even if it did in this case he could be paid nothing prior to the date of the passage of the bill.

Mr. BRUCE. I want to vote for the Senator's bill, but I want him to let me know what there was in those affidavits that tended to create a just impression that this man in point of fact had not been guilty of theft at all but had deliberately

sacrificed himself from generous motives for the sake of somebody else.

Mr. BARKLEY. The affidavits of two of his comrades are very positive that he obtained nothing; that he obtained no property whatever; that he happened to be in a position of responsibility on the occasion when the articles were taken, and that he refused to exculpate himself simply in order not to inform on his comrades.

Mr. BRUCE. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 7324. Is there objection?

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the consideration of the bill, but I voted against the bill in committee, and I want to state why; that is all. I am not against the bill at all. I simply voted against it in the committee, and I think it is proper for me to make my statement here.

This man, it seems, was convicted of a theft many, many years ago. The other man is now dead, and it looks a little bit hard to take the stain off of the living man, because he has some witnesses living who swear that it was not he who was guilty, and switch the responsibility and the disgrace over to the children of the dead man.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that since this matter was up the other day I have ascertained that the man who is, by implication, referred to in these affidavits, is still living.

Mr. BLEASE. Then it looks to me as if he ought to be given a chance to present his side of the case. That is the only objection I have, and that is why I voted against the bill in the committee; by myself, however. I have made no minority report. It looks hard to me to switch the disgrace off one man to another man after about 30 years.

Mr. KING. Without giving him a chance.

Mr. BLEASE. Yes. I do not object to the bill, but I wanted to be clear.

Mr. BARKLEY. The affidavits merely mention another man inferentially; they do not make him out guilty of a crime. They merely mention him as being in a position of responsibility at the same time, but they make no effort whatever to shift the burden of this offense from the man who is relieved by this bill onto the shoulders of the sergeant, or anybody else. They merely mention him incidentally, inferentially, in their affidavits.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In the meeting of the committee the impression was given to the committee that evidence of this other man was unavailable because of his death.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not seek to create that impression.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not mean that the Senator from Kentucky intentionally misled the committee, or that anybody else did; but that was the belief the committee had, and it seems to me that if the man is now discovered to be living, in fairness to the committee, it ought to have some affidavit from him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know where he is. I got this information from the Member of the House who introduced the bill there, that the man is not dead, and the reason I went to the trouble to ask about it was that the Senator from South Carolina seemed to think that the mere fact that he was mentioned in the other affidavits created the presumption that he was dead, and that now that he was dead an effort was being made to shift the responsibility onto him. That is not the case at all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not know about the other members of the committee, but I had the impression that evidence from him was unobtainable because of his death.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was an unfortunate impression, and there was no intention to create such an impression. I do not know whether his evidence would be available or not, but in view of the whole circumstances, the character of this man, his record, his enlistment, and service for four full years, when the sergeant who took his enlistment knew all about these circumstances, and knew about this charge, and in view of his honorable discharge from the Marine Corps after four years' service, with the commendation of the Marine Corps, certainly these facts ought to wipe out any suspicion that might exist that this man is trying now to take advantage of somebody else in order to get his record corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIFTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to call up House bill 393, an act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses. I take this action because the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has to leave the city to-morrow, and I know he is going to object to the consideration of the bill, and desires to make probably a 5-minute statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to make a statement to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, in charge of this census bill, in the hope that it will appeal to his sense of constitutional fidelity and result in a postponement of the consideration of this matter.

This is the proposition to seek to present: A census bill, under the Constitution, has but one function; it has had but one function ever since the Constitution was written, and if anybody doubts this plain mandate in the instrument itself he merely has to consult Mr. Randolph's language as he proposed the census provision in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He said its purpose was "to redress inequalities in representation."

In other words, the Constitution, directly, by its own unmistakably mandatory language, and by the purport and aim of its authors, gives a census just this one constitutional function, namely, provide a basis for the reapportionment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, in the face of the fact that the 1920 census has not yet been validated under the Constitution in this fundamental constitutional function, I submit to the judgment of the Senate and my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Washington, that it would be a travesty on good faith, a travesty on congressional consistency, and a travesty upon constitutional integrity, for us to pass still another census bill, except as we make sure, in the same connection and at the same time, that this constitutional function shall not be continually emasculated. There has been no reapportionment since August 8, 1911. This lapse is a gross contempt of the Constitution and a violent trespass upon the right of representation. It must not continue. I propose to submit that we should take our stand upon this 1930 census bill.

From 1790 to 1910, from the First to the Thirteenth Censuses, Congress never permitted more than two years to elapse between the counting of the people and the use of that basic constitutional arithmetic for the reapportionment of the House of Representatives. As a result of eight years of failure, however, to sustain this rule since the census of 1920 was completed, many great constituencies have been victimized. My own State of Michigan, for example, has over 2,000,000 people in three of our congressional districts, and many other States are similarly victimized. The electoral college is victimized, because it is exposed to the hazard of a legal question as to its constitutional sufficiency, in case of a close election. But the main challenge is that the Constitution itself is victimized, and in the very House of those who are foresworn to its special and particular defense.

This is the thought I submit to the Senator from Washington: The Senate, unfortunately, holds a primary responsibility for the situation in which we find ourselves, because the House of Representatives did validate the census of 1920. It did pass a reapportionment measure on January 19, 1921. The bill did come to this body. It was sent to a committee of the Senate, but from that committee it never came back alive. Therefore the Senate particularly is challenged by these eight years of constitutional lapse. It is challenged to take up its tragically interrupted defense of our constitutional institutions.

Therefore I am suggesting that unless a reapportionment measure comes into this Chamber from the honorable gentlemen who compose the other body of our parliament within the next few weeks, I propose to attach to this 1930 census bill a reapportionment measure as an amendment. There is ample precedent for such a course. Precisely, this thing was done in 1850 under the so-called Vinton amendments. This process brought the census and reapportionment together in the law. They are together in the Constitution. They have been together in 120 years of congressional precedent and practice—up to 1910. They have got to resume this sacred relationship. The Senate can not escape its share of responsibility to this end because we are constitutional partners with the House in the maintenance of this fundamen-

Therefore I am asking the chairman of the committee to withdraw his request for the present consideration of this census bill for the present, and to withhold it until we can be sure what

steps must be taken here by way of reapportionment which shall protect our constitutional responsibility for an honest validation of the census law under the Constitution. Mr. President, we must validate our oaths.

I would like to ask my generous and considerate friend from Washington if he does not concur in my point of view.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator that I think I am in full accord with his suggestion, and sympathize with the attitude he takes. I do think this, that while it is true that the Senate failed to act on this legislation a good many years ago, it has in fact had no opportunity to act since that time, because it is generally understood that another body of the Congress is essentially interested in these apportionment bills, and while I can see no excuse for the Senate not acting when the other body did act several years ago, yet neither House, in my judgment, is without blame for not acting during the last six or seven years. There has been full opportunity to comply with the plain and express mandate of the Constitution. I can see no excuse for either House of Congress for failure to do that, and I hope that before this session of Congress shall expire, the delayed action will be taken, and that we will not be in the position hereafter of neglecting the plain mandate of the Constitution in this regard.

I had hoped that the Senator would not object to the consideration of this bill, but I appreciate his position, and I appreciate his purpose in rising and making the remarks he has made. I can make no complaint at his suggestion that this measure should go over until at least after the holidays. So I withdraw my request for the consideration of the bill at this time.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR CORPS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, yesterday a bill granting a separate promotion list to the Air Corps, which has been referred to at various times in the conventions of the American Legion and in the meetings of the National Aeronautical Association as the Furlow bill, which came over from the House in the shape of an amendment to another bill, with other amendments, instead of being sent to conference was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The same bill passed the House of Representatives on the 7th of last May, came over to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and was amended and is now on the calendar as Order of Business 1138.

In view of the fact that we have already sent one form of this bill back to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration, it seems only fair that the original bill, known as the Furlow bill, should be sent back to that committee also, and I ask unanimous consent that House bill 12814, to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps, be rereferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Objection is made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just going to say that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is greatly interested in this matter, and in his absence I would hope that it might go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made, and the bill will go over.

CONSTRUCTION AT WEST POINT

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in order that certain Budget estimates may be prepared and transmitted in sufficient time to go into the second deficiency bill, the War Department is anxious to obtain action on a House bill making authorizations for certain very necessary quarters at West Point, quarters for noncommissioned officers and officers of the teaching faculty, who are now on rental status, at a place far from West Point, where they have to get allowances and all that to enable them to live, and where they are only able to live with great discomfort, and with much difficulty in the winter in getting to West Point.

The authorization bill is Order of Business 1379. As Senators will see, the total authorization is \$672,000. It will take care of a very large number of officers and noncommissioned officers who at present are without quarters in the reservation. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11469) to authorize appropriations for construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It was unanimously reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just going to ask the Senator whether the report was unanimous.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The committee was unanimous in its report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will give me his attention for a moment, my recollection is that at the last session a very large appropriation was made for buildings at West Point; and at the session preceding that, and at the session preceding that, we made very large appropriations, amounting to millions of dollars, for West Point during the past five or six years. While what I am about to say now would not particularly refer to this, we have in addition made general appropriations for buildings under the direction of the Army. I was wondering, with all these appropriations, rather lavish and rather generous, why it is necessary.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator is right. Congress has been liberal to West Point in the matter of the erection of additional barracks and accommodations, and additional buildings for mess hall and class rooms. But this is an authorization that takes care, not of the students or cadets there, but of some of the teaching staff and some of the noncommissioned officers who get no benefit whatever from the appropriations heretofore made.

Conditions there, if the Senator were to see them, would be described by him as shocking. There are noncommissioned officers in frame buildings built away back almost to the time of the Civil War, where the married noncoms and their families are herded together in a way that is really disgraceful, where several families with grown children have to use one common bathroom. More than 20 people were found belonging to different families using the same bathroom and toilet. The only place the women of those families can cook the meals for the families is in the cellar, and it is not easy for a family living on the third floor of a fire trap like that to use a kitchen in a dark cellar room. I was up there three weeks ago and went through the quarters which it is proposed to replace under the bill. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] was with me. Both of us were shocked at the conditions we found there.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Surely.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be it has been answered, because I was called out of the Chamber and just returned. I understand, and it seems to be conceded, that Congress has been very liberal with West Point with appropriations heretofore in the general appropriation bills. Why is it that the money we have appropriated heretofore has been expended exclusively for officers' quarters?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, it has not been. It has been expended, as the appropriation bills required, for the construction of a new mess hall, a new classroom, and additional barracks, made necessary for cadet quarters because of the increase in the number of cadets.

Mr. NORRIS. What particular class of people connected with the Government are going to be provided for by this item?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. These are the noncommissioned officers of the enlisted troops that are stationed there to help in the teaching of these young men as cadets. Most of the beneficiaries of this program will be the enlisted men, the married noncommissioned officers. They are not cadets. None of the cadets is married. These are the regular enlisted men stationed there as a part of the program for the training of the cadets.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator another question. Will the additional appropriation interfere with the President's economy program?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am inclined to think the President's program is sufficiently flexible to stand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a mythical term, anyway.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, is it mythical?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to be led into the predicament of putting our country, as the President's message described, in a disgraceful financial position by having a deficit.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator need have any trouble about that. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I see there is a statement made by the Secretary of War that the sum stated for officers' quarters is to provide an apartment suitable for 36 married officers as recommended by the 1927 board of officers. Does he refer to the noncommissioned officers?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; that has reference to the commissioned officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said a moment ago these buildings were to be built for noncommissioned officers and I was wondering whether the 36 were really noncommissioned officers. I imagine they are Regular Army officers stationed there now and who at this time have inadequate quarters.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is true with reference to the first item. They are commissioned officers. The second item is for noncommissioned officers of the group I have described.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think the buildings ought to be constructed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania how much of this money goes for the use of noncommissioned officers?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As we have provided it, \$507,000 goes for quarters for the 36 married commissioned officers and their families.

Mr. JONES. Does not the Senator think that is pretty high for 36 families?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, no; I do not. Fifteen thousand dollars for a house for an officer with a family is not too much.

Mr. JONES. These are not very high-class officers, I take it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are regular officers of the Regular Army.

Mr. JONES. Regular commissioned officers?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; and in addition to that we have increased the appropriation for noncommissioned officers' quarters to \$165,000, which will provide 25 sets to take care of the noncommissioned officers who at present are living in the fire traps I have described. Then I might say, to complete the explanation, that we have cut out an item which the House put in for a veterinary hospital, because the old one seemed to us on examination to be quite sufficient.

Mr. NORRIS. We have reached the stage now where instead of a veterinary hospital we had better put in a garage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11469, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11469) to authorize appropriations for construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Military Affairs were, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "\$609,000" and insert "\$672,000"; same page, line 8, strike out "\$384,000" and insert "\$507,000"; same page, line 9, strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$165,000"; same page, lines 9 and 10, and page 2, line 1, to strike out the words "for veterinary hospital, \$25,000; for alterations to the West Academic Building, \$50,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$672,000 to be expended for the construction and installation at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., of such buildings, utilities, and appurtenances as may be necessary, as follows: For officers' quarters, \$507,000; for noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$165,000: *Provided*, That the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., with the approval of the Secretary of War, is authorized to employ architects to draw the necessary plans and specifications from funds herein authorized, when appropriated.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 21, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONCILIATION WITH ALBANIA

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Albania, signed at Washington on October 22, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Albania, signed at Washington October 22, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the Albanians, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of the Albanians:

Mr. Falk Konitza, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Albania in the United States of America;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Albania, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Albania in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English and Albanian languages, the English text to have authority in case of conflict between the two texts, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the twenty-second day of October, in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

FRANK B. KELLOGG [SEAL]
FAİK KONITZA [SEAL]

CONCILIATION WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Czechoslovakia, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view of its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Czechoslovakia, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Czechoslovak Republic, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The President of the Czechoslovak Republic:

Mr. Zdeněk Fierlinger, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Czechoslovak Republic at Washington;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Czechoslovakia, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate, one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Czechoslovakia in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Prague as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English and Czechoslovak languages, both texts having equal force, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the sixteenth day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

FRANK B. KELLOGG [SEAL]
Zd. FIERLINGER [SEAL]

CONCILIATION WITH POLAND

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Poland, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Poland, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Poland, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America

Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States;

The President of the Republic of Poland

Mr. Jan Ciechanowski, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Poland to the United States;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Poland, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: one member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country;

the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country.

The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement.

The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the President of the Republic of Poland in accordance with Polish constitutional law.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Warsaw as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate, each in the English and Polish languages, both texts having equal force, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the 16th day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

FRANK B. KELLOGG. [SEAL]
JAN CIECHANOWSKI. [SEAL]

CONCILIATION WITH LITHUANIA

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Lithuania, signed at Washington on November 14, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Lithuania, signed at Washington on November 14, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Lithuania

Being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States of America;

The President of the Republic of Lithuania:

Mr. Bronius K. Balutis, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Lithuania at Washington;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Lithuania, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Lithuania in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the fourteenth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

FRANK B. KELLOGG [SEAL]
B. K. BALUTIS [SEAL]

CONCILIATION WITH FINLAND

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Finland, signed at Washington on June 7, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with the view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Finland, signed at Washington on June 7, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Finland, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America,
Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States;

The President of the Republic of Finland,
Mr. L. Aström, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Finland, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Finland in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English language, and hereunto affix their seals.

Done at Washington the seventh day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

[SEAL]
[SEAL]

FRANK B. KELLOGG
L. ASTRÖM

CONCILIATION WITH AUSTRIA

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified and, on motion of Mr. BORAH, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Austria, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1928.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States and Austria, signed at Washington on August 16, 1928.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 1, 1928.

The President of the United States of America and the Federal President of the Republic of Austria, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have resolved to enter into a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The Federal President of the Republic of Austria, Mr. Edgar L. G. Prochnik, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States of America,

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Austria, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding Article; and the High Contracting Parties agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country, by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be appointed within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original appointment.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Permanent International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The High Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE IV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Austria in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English and German languages, both texts having equal force, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the sixteenth day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

FRANK B. KELLOGG
EDGAR PROCHNIK

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 20, 1928

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be chaplain

Rev. Walter Hilary Paschal, of South Dakota, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, with rank from December 14, 1928.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lieut. Charles Speir Lawrence, Infantry (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), with rank from October 26, 1924.

SIGNAL CORPS

First Lieut. Donald Campbell Kemp, Cavalry (detailed in Signal Corps), with rank from July 1, 1920.

AIR CORPS

Second Lieut. Walter Sylvester Lee, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 30, 1926.

Second Lieut. Julius Theodore Flock, Signal Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Bernard Cecil Rose, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Robert Lewis Easton, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 14, 1927.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Gustave Rudolph Lukesh, Corps of Engineers, from December 13, 1928.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. John Charles French, Infantry, from December 13, 1928.

Maj. John Walter Downer, Field Artillery, from December 15, 1928.

To be majors

Capt. Robert Chauncey Macon, Infantry, from December 13, 1928.

Capt. Oron Allston Palmer, Cavalry, from December 15, 1928.

Capt. Stanley Bacon, Field Artillery, from December 17, 1928.

To be captains

First Lieut. William Seymour Gravely, Air Corps, from December 13, 1928.

First Lieut. Harlan Ware Holden, Air Corps, from December 13, 1928.

First Lieut. John Francis Somers, Infantry, from December 13, 1928.

First Lieut. LeRoy Moore Wightman, Cavalry, from December 13, 1928.

First Lieut. Harry Ruhl Leblicher, Chemical Warfare Service, from December 15, 1928.

First Lieut. Ernest Stratton Barker, Infantry, from December 17, 1928.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Felix Nicholson Parsons, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 8, 1928.

Second Lieut. Ben Early Cordell, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Dalies Joshua Oyster, Field Artillery, from November 10, 1928.

Second Lieut. George Phillips Privett, Field Artillery, from November 13, 1928.

Second Lieut. Richard Howell Dean, Air Corps, from November 13, 1928.

Second Lieut. Carl Adam Kugel, Infantry, from November 16, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Lindsay McPherson, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 17, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Vincent Gray, Infantry, from November 18, 1928.

Second Lieut. Rowland Kiebertz, Air Corps, from November 18, 1928.

Second Lieut. Daniel Peter Norman, Infantry, from November 19, 1928.

Second Lieut. John Mitchell England, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 20, 1928.

Second Lieut. Floyd Cornelius Devenbeck, Ordnance Department, from November 21, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Black Forse, Infantry, from November 22, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Brown Short, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 23, 1928.

Second Lieut. John Wallace Homewood, Infantry, from November 24, 1928.

Second Lieut. James Vestie Collier, Field Artillery, from November 25, 1928.

Second Lieut. Edwin Kennedy Wright, Infantry, from November 26, 1928.

Second Lieut. Clint Leroy Taylor, Field Artillery, from November 26, 1928.

Second Lieut. Richard Herbert Torovsky, Infantry, from November 27, 1928.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Francis S. Wagner to be postmaster at Alta Loma, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1928.

Harry L. Todd to be postmaster at San Francisco, Calif., in place of J. E. Power, resigned.

FLORIDA

Marion C. Douglas to be postmaster at De Land, Fla., in place of M. C. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1928.

GEORGIA

Anna C. Williams to be postmaster at Lumpkin, Ga., in place of A. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

ILLINOIS

George W. Fritz to be postmaster at Durand, Ill., in place of G. W. Fritz. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1928.

Henry W. Mathis to be postmaster at Morton, Ill., in place of H. W. Mathis. Incumbent's commission expires January 3, 1929.

Russell L. Gibson to be postmaster at South Holland, Ill., in place of R. A. Gouwens, resigned.

Lou R. Carmichael to be postmaster at Stillman Valley, Ill., in place of L. R. Carmichael. Incumbent's commission expires January 3, 1929.

INDIANA

Fred Youkey to be postmaster at Thorntown, Ind., in place of Nathan Riley, resigned.

IOWA

Dorothy E. Parden to be postmaster at George, Iowa, in place of D. E. Parden. Incumbent's commission expires January 3, 1929.

KANSAS

Herbert H. Blidden to be postmaster at Osborne, Kans., in place of C. W. Weeks, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Milton E. Kidd to be postmaster at Choudrant, La., in place of M. E. Kidd. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1928.

MINNESOTA

Ernest A. Schilling to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. A. Schilling. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1928.

Raymond P. Erickson to be postmaster at Franklin, Minn., in place of R. P. Erickson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1928.

Joseph L. Scalise, to be postmaster at Marble, Minn., in place of M. A. Dickens. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1926.

Norman L. Swanson to be postmaster at Moose Lake, Minn., in place of N. L. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1928.

Kenneth Cobb to be postmaster at Norcross, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1928.

Ora D. Thompson to be postmaster at Porter, Minn., in place of O. D. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1928.

NEBRASKA

Earl J. Hughes to be postmaster at Concord, Nebr., in place of E. J. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1928.

J. Lyndon Thornton to be postmaster at Fairbury, Nebr., in place of J. L. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1928.

Carl G. Fricke to be postmaster at Nelson, Nebr., in place of Robert Greenwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1928.

Henry D. Grady to be postmaster at O'Neill, Nebr., in place of H. D. Grady. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1928.

NEW JERSEY

Stephen T. Garrison to be postmaster at Port Norris, N. J., in place of S. T. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expires January 3, 1929.

NEW YORK

Robert E. Brown to be postmaster at Almond, N. Y., in place of R. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 2, 1929.

Anna M. Ball to be postmaster at Berkshire, N. Y., in place of A. M. Ball. Incumbent's commission expires January 2, 1929.

William E. Seaman to be postmaster at Glenwood Landing, N. Y. Office made presidential July 1, 1928.

NORTH CAROLINA

John H. Freshwater to be postmaster at Haw River, N. C., in place of N. E. Bullard, resigned.

OHIO

Ida S. Reinheimer to be postmaster at Kelleys Island, Ohio, in place of F. J. Reinheimer, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

William Carson to be postmaster at Lone Wolf, Okla., in place of William Carson. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1928.

PENNSYLVANIA

John D. Titman to be postmaster at Montrose, Pa., in place of A. L. Titman, deceased.

Herbert O. Hornbake to be postmaster at South Brownsville, Pa., in place of H. O. Hornbake. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1928.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John Harms to be postmaster at Bonesteel, S. Dak., in place of N. D. Law, resigned.

Earl F. Vandenburg to be postmaster at Conde, S. Dak., in place of E. F. Vandenburg. Incumbent's commission expires January 2, 1929.

Norman Lockwood to be postmaster at Doland, S. Dak., in place of Norman Lockwood. Incumbent's commission expires January 2, 1929.

TEXAS

Robert J. King to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tex., in place of J. L. Reed, resigned.

Brice C. Howard to be postmaster at Damon, Tex., in place of O. M. Neighbor, resigned.

Kelley McLean to be postmaster at Melvin, Tex., in place of M. O. Brice, resigned.

William M. Casey to be postmaster at Monahans, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1928.

Imogen H. Garvin to be postmaster at Navasota, Tex., in place of J. W. Garvin, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lewis E. Winston to be postmaster at Ethel, W. Va., in place of L. E. Winston. Incumbent's commission expires January 2, 1929.

Oral C. Hathaway to be postmaster at Grantsville, W. Va., in place of Tell McDonald, resigned.

Charles B. Goodwin to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of Earle Reger. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1928.

WISCONSIN

Muriel B. Abdo to be postmaster at Highland, Wis., in place of E. M. Dolan, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20, 1928

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Robert W. Wingfield, Camp Verde.

CALIFORNIA

Francis S. Wagner, Alta Loma.

Harry L. Todd, San Francisco.

COLORADO

James S. Bradbury, Silt.

FLORIDA

Marion C. Douglas, De Land.

GEORGIA

John W. Moore, Crawford.

Walter L. Turner, Lagrange.

Johnnie B. Roddenbery, Thomasville.

Anna C. Williams, Lumpkin.

ILLINOIS

Bessie B. Williams, Akin.

Herman H. Schultz, Bartlett.

Herman Meyer, Bellewood.

Florence R. Edwards, Buffalo.

Rufus D. Denton, Carthage.

Mary H. Hrdlicka, Cary.

Walter K. Lepp, Collinsville.

Harry V. Popejoy, Cropsey.

Laurence E. Brookfelt, Dolton.

John H. Stolle, Evansville.

Edward W. Draper, Evergreen Park.

Mary Slocum, Franklin Park.

David A. Howard, Glasford.

Frederick Rugen, Glenview.

Charles Jackson, Joy.

Jean T. Johnson, Kewanee.

Homer W. Witter, Kingston.

Rex C. Bliss, La Fayette.

George A. Bowen, Lake Bluff.

Anna B. Dorsey, Lovejoy.

Elizabeth Johnston, McNabb.

Louis W. Richter, Melrose Park.

Leah M. LeMarr, Modesto.

George E. Carlson, Moline.

Harry C. Smith, New Windsor.

William E. Kitch, Niantic.

Walter W. Schultz, Oakglen.

Alice Murray, Oneida.

John F. Schmadeke, Orland Park.

Lloyd Ritzenthaler, Prairie View.

Chester O. Burgess, Sigel.

Cora I. Kennet, Strawn.

Roscoe A. Lance, Table Grove.

Clayton G. Blanchard, Tamaroa.

Clarence S. Viall, Thornton.

John Hudson, Valier.

Fred Frazier, Viola.

Oscar B. Park, Wapella.

Vera M. Carlson, Woodhull.

George W. Fritz, Durand.

Henry W. Mathis, Morton.

Russell L. Gibson, South Holland.

Lou R. Carmichael, Stillman Valley.

INDIANA

Fred Youkey, Thorntown.

IOWA

Samuel W. Campbell, Anthon.

Verne T. Herrick, Bridgewater.

John T. Bargenholt, Orient.

Clarence D. Bourke, Primghar.

Arthur O. Reinhardt, Van Horne.

Bruce R. Mills, Woodbine.

Elizabeth Summers, Fort Atkinson.

Ludwig C. Pedersen, Kimballton.

Elmer F. Walter, Manly.
Estella Griffin, McIntire.
Dorothy E. Parden, George.

KANSAS

Herbert H. Glidden, Osborne.

KENTUCKY

Stanley Byers, Horse Branch.
Jennie S. May, Stone.

LOUISIANA

Milton E. Kidd, Choudrant.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edmund Daly, Hingham.
Fred A. Tower, Concord.
Lester G. Lathrop, Orange.
John P. McKay, Wellfleet.

MINNESOTA

Anna C. Dallaire, Ah-gwah-ching.
Fred E. Logelin, Belleplaine.
John V. Barstow, Brownsdale.
Isaac R. Lamppa, jr., Embarrass.
Nelson S. Erb, Faribault.
Carl A. Qvale, Farmington.
Edward C. Ellertson, Gully.
John L. Christianson, Harmony.
Alfred L. Mallery, Lakeville.
Emil C. Ernst, Lester Prairie.
Carl A. Ecklund, Marine on St. Croix.
James H. Pelham, Menahga.
Peter W. Gorrie, Morristown.
Walter E. Johnson, New Richland.
Ernest E. Meyer, Norwood.
Laura Z. Cairns, Rice.
Emil Rasmussen, Sleepy Eye.
Albert W. Knaak, Waterville.
Carrie B. Quinn, Wells.
Albert A. Peterson, Blooming Prairie.
Julius Severson, Clitherall.
Omer C. Heys, Glyndon.
Harry U. Boe, Hayfield.
Alice Gillespie, Kilkenny.
Frederick S. Purdy, Russell.
Nellie A. Everett, Scandia.
Sadie A. Lane, Sherburn.
Halvor Robberstad, Warroad.
Ernest A. Schilling, Cottonwood.
Raymond P. Erickson, Franklin.
Joseph L. Scalise, Marble.
Norman L. Swanson, Moose Lake.
Kenneth Cobb, Norcross.
Ora D. Thompson, Porter.

MISSOURI

Henry L. Windler, Barnett.
Joe W. Ralston, Clarksburg.
Hobart Lewis, Downing.
Stephen C. Accola, La Grange.
John F. Burrell, Mountain View.
Albert L. Brady, Oran.
Lizzie A. Rademaker, Parma.

MONTANA

J. Clarence Manix, Augusta.
Charles E. June, Forsyth.

NEBRASKA

Arthur F. Jarman, Ashland.
Arnold J. Fiala, Brainard.
Laura M. Baird, Cairo.
Leroy L. Ambler, Holbrook.
Henry L. Nichols, Lebanon.
George W. Whitehead, Mason City.
George E. Barto, Wakefield.
Minnie M. Morrow, Winside.
George H. Holdeman, York.
Earl J. Hughes, Concord.
J. Lyndon Thornton, Fairbury.
Carl G. Fricke, Nelson.
Henry D. Grady, O'Neill.

NEW JERSEY

Stephen T. Garrison, Port Norris.
Vivian O. Walters, Franklin.
Berta Baker, Leonardo.
Philip E. Rockafellow, Stockton.
Louis Meretta, Zarephath.

NEW MEXICO

Mahan Wyman, Loving.
Agnes M. Walsh, Santa Rita.

NEW YORK

Leslie E. Daniels, Chaumont.
Guy Shook, Claverack.
Richard J. Higgins, East Rockaway.
William L. Fuller, Ellenville.
Roy M. Hackett, Hornell.
Charles E. Hardy, Hudson.
Edwin W. Cushman, Keuka Park.
James Agnew, Lake Ronkonkoma.
Harmon A. Ranous, Minetto.
Perry Deyo, New Paltz.
Chris Fox, St. Johnsville.
Eleanor C. Griffing, Shelter Island.
Edith L. Kent, Tuxedo Park.
Daniel Van Alst, Walkill.
Loie C. Husted, Woodhull.
Robert E. Brown, Almond.
Anna M. Ball, Berkshire.
William E. Seaman, Glenwood Landing.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raymond C. Barker, Badin.
Bessie Sigmon, Claremont.
Orletta L. Landis, Columbus.
Lena C. Dellinger, Crossnore.
Ella N. Painter, Cullowhee.
Mary E. Ross, New London.
Charles R. Bowman, Oak Ridge.
Frances K. Thagard, Pembroke.
John G. Morefield, Rural Hall.
Leona S. Proctor, Varina.
Annie Deese, Willard.
John H. Freshwater, Haw River.

NORTH DAKOTA

Karl Fischer, Hague.
Erick Myhre, Hampden.
Katie H. Hanson, Munich.

OHIO

George H. Scheetz, Bridgeport.
Edwin Seedhouse, Doylestown.
John T. Wood, East Liverpool.
Jennie Fickes, Empire.
Bayard F. Thompson, Jewett.
John M. McConnell, Mingo Junction.
Wellington T. Huntsman, Toledo.
Ida S. Reinheimer, Kelleys Island.

OKLAHOMA

Charles F. Ritcheson, Maysville.
Boone A. Leatherman, Rooston.
Joseph Beasley, jr., Bowlegs.
Walter C. Campbell, Carnegie.
Minnie A. Eaton, Inola.
Madge Morris, Lyman.
Emmette R. Talley, Mangum.
William Carson, Lone Wolf.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carey W. Huff, Durant City.
Albert R. Morgan, Nemacolin.
John D. Titman, Montrose.
Herbert O. Hornbake, South Brownsville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John Harms, Bonesteel.
Earl F. Vandenburg, Conde.
Norman Lockwood, Doland.

TENNESSEE

Jesse L. Hope, Lenoir City.

TEXAS

Samuel J. Hott, Channing.
William G. Shelton, East Bernard.
Emma Woody, Girard.
Jim H. McFarlin, Liberty Hill.
Mary M. Ferrel, Roby.
Cynthia M. Martin, San Augustine.
Walter J. Kveton, Sealy.
William R. Holton, Thornton.
Robert J. King, Clarksville.
Brice C. Howard, Damon.
Kelley McLean, Melvin.
William M. Casey, Monahans.
Imogen H. Garvin, Navasota.

UTAH

Paul G. Johnson, Grantsville.
David T. Lewis, Spanish Fork.

VERMONT

Hiram E. Rowe, Barnet.
Donald J. Wilson, Bristol.
D. Viola Sawyer, Craftsbury.
Herman D. Webster, East Burke.
William H. C. Whitcomb, Forest Dale.
Philip A. Bartlett, Island Pond.
Ethel E. Churchill, Quechee.
Otis B. Dauchy, Townshend.
Kenneth A. Foster, Wolcott.

VIRGINIA

James L. Humbert, Charlottesville.
Byron Austin, Falls Church.
Mary E. Gregory, Drakes Branch.
Thomas J. Crickenberger, Emporia.
Florence E. Priest, Scottsburg.

WASHINGTON

John F. Moyer, College Place.
Thurston B. Stidham, Doty.
William W. Johnson, Easton.
William C. Hubbard, Klickitat.
Cora A. Smith, Seaview.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lewis E. Winston, Ethel.
Oral C. Hathaway, Grantsville.
Charles B. Goodwin, Weston.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, December 20, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that there are many sorrows and disappointments which we have never experienced. At times prompted by anger, by passion, by wicked motive, oh, we thank Thee for the words we did not speak; continue to bless us with the grace of repression. Give us gladness and contentment concurrent with our cares and duties. With eager certainty help us to measure ourselves against the tasks of to-day. Fill our souls with a calm assurance, and may every word and every act flow forth from the unstained and unsullied fountains of conscious rectitude and uprightness. Our Heavenly Father, make us tender toward the erring and forbearing with the forms of human weakness. In the holy name of Jesus, our Savior, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 281

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. FAUST, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the foregoing resolutions, the Vice President had appointed Mr. HAWES, Mr. FESS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKHART, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. VANDENBERG members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7729. An act to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases; and

H. R. 15089. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 20, 1928.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Elections, No. 2, to become effective immediately.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

JOE CRAIL.

The resignation was accepted.

THE LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following letter of the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1928.

HON. JOHN M. MORIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MORIN: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1928, on page 8321, in the discussion relative to H. R. 11847, "To authorize the acquisition of land in Hawaii," there appear certain remarks which are critical of Army officers in general, and in a letter from the Governor of Hawaii to a Member of Congress which is inserted in the remarks of this Member are statements criticizing a former commanding general of the Hawaiian Department.

I feel it my duty to come to the defense of these officers, and with that object in view I shall present herein certain facts taken from the War Department records in refutation of the criticisms which have been directed against them. I believe that consideration of the data which I shall present will show that the officers concerned were carrying out their duties in accordance with War Department policies and the will of Congress as expressed in the act approved by the President on January 31, 1922.

The act to which reference is made, known as the land exchange act, was first introduced in Congress by the Hon. Julius Kahn in November, 1919. This bill was prepared by the War Department and was introduced at its request in the interest of economy for the purpose of securing the authority of Congress to exchange public lands in Hawaii for privately owned lands which were urgently needed. The specific tracts to which reference is made in the letter from the Governor of Hawaii are those known as the Kalena tract, consisting of approximately 254 acres located in the heart of the Schofield Barracks Military Reservation and owned by Mr. L. L. McCandless, and the Makua tract, which was Territorial property. It was indispensable that the Government should acquire the Kalena tract, as it was located on the target range of the Schofield Barracks Reservation and had been constantly used by the troops since the occupancy of that post. An effort was made to obtain it by purchase, and funds to the amount of \$30,300 were appropriated in 1917 and 1920. The owner, however, valued the land at \$60,000 and it was believed that condemnation proceedings would award at least that amount for the property. In view of the necessity for the most rigid economy in appropriations for the Army, an effort was made to effect its acquisition by exchanging other land therefor.

At the same time the acquisition of other needed tracts was proposed by this same method. Abundant evidence as to the need for these transfers, with the estimated value of the property concerned, was furnished to the Senate and House Military Committees and to the Committee on Territories. It was supported by the then governor, Hon. C. J. McCarthy, as shown by the following extract from a letter from him dated December 22, 1922:

"This bill remained before Congress for three years, until I came to Washington, and upon explaining the matter to the Military Committees of both the House and the Senate it finally became law January 31, 1922."

The Committee on Territories reported the bill favorably in Report No. 49, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session. After repeated efforts, the bill was finally passed and was approved by the President January 31, 1922.

The War Department records show that preliminary negotiations with reference to the acquisition of the Kalena tract by the War Department prior to the passage of the act were carried on between Maj. Gen. C. G. Morton, commanding general Hawaiian Department, Hon. C. J. McCarthy, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, and Mr. L. L. McCandless, owner of the Kalena tract. It appears that General Morton, Gov-

ernor McCarthy, and Mr. McCandless were all agreed as to the consummation of the following exchanges:

"The Kalena tract to the War Department.

"Part of the Waimanalo tract to the Territory of Hawaii.

"The Makua tract to Mr. McCandless."

The valuations placed upon these tracts of land then and later underwent great changes.

In the letter from Governor McCarthy, to which reference has been made above, the transfer of Sand Island, a very valuable part of Honolulu Harbor, from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii, was emphasized. This tract was worth vastly more than the Makua tract or any other tract under consideration. On September 19, 1923, the commanding general Hawaiian Department proposed in a letter to the Governor of Hawaii to transfer Sand Island, subject to certain rights of the War Department to be agreed upon, to the Territory of Hawaii for the Kalena tract or other property for which the Kalena tract might be acquired.

In his reply, dated September 24, 1923, the governor objected to any transfer of Territorial land for privately owned land, and contended that such land should be obtained by condemnation. He stated that he would revise a verbal proposal of Governor McCarthy so that the exchange for the Makua land would include Sand Island and the Kealahala tract of 218 acres, and all of the Waimanalo lands, 1,510 acres. His proposal was not favorably considered because most of the Waimanalo tract and the Kealahala tract were required for military purposes. His objection to the transfer of the Makua tract to private ownership would have nullified the intent of the law. Thereupon, the commanding general Hawaiian Department reported to the War Department that the counterproposals were not favorably considered and that no further recommendation as to this exchange could be made, and on April 16, 1924, requested that the Kalena tract be acquired by condemnation and purchase.

The records of the War Department show that as no agreement could be reached, the Governor of Hawaii came to Washington with the intention of carrying out the wishes of the Hawaiian Legislature to have various tracts of land owned by the War Department transferred to the Territory. He reiterated in conference with representatives of the War Department his attitude as expressed to the department commander. He then requested the transfer to the Territory, without anything in exchange, of about 100 acres of the Kealahala Reservation upon the representation that it was needed for an insane asylum. His efforts were successful, and on June 26, 1924, an Executive order was issued transferring such a portion to the Territory together with the valuable water supply known as the Spring Reserve Lot.

There are no further records of negotiations between the Governor of Hawaii and the commanding general Hawaiian Department. It is thus seen that the statement of the Governor of Hawaii, that "General Summerall when first assuming command down here at the beginning of my administration tried his best to force me to carry out a land exchange which would have resulted in the Territory giving up control of over 2,000 acres to private interests in order that the Army might secure 254 acres of the Kalena tract" is not in accord with the records at the War Department.

With reference to the statement that "the Army officers in Hawaii have been reckless in their waste of the public domain," and the specific mention of Mr. Dillingham, the records of the War Department show that at a conference with the Chief of Staff of the Army November 17, 1923, the Governor of Hawaii stated that he was not opposed to the exchange of Government-owned lands for privately owned lands, except the Waimanalo and Sand Island Reservations. These reservations were not involved in any such exchanges. On April 11, 1924, the commanding general Hawaiian Department recommended to the War Department the following land exchanges: The Federal Government to acquire—

- (a) A tract of approximately 105.46 acres situated on the north shore of Oahu for camping and training purposes.
- (b) A fire-control position on Pupukea Plateau.
- (c) A battery position on Pupukea Plateau.
- (d) A fire-control site on the slope of Mount Kaala.
- (e) A fire-control site and battery position indicated on a map.

The Federal Government to relinquish to private ownership 9.2 acres on the Fort Ruger Military Reservation and 62 acres of the Lualualei Military Reservation.

The proceedings of the board of appraisers provided for in the land exchange act were forwarded to the War Department, showing the following values:

Private land to be acquired by the War Department.....	\$30,823.85
War Department land to be transferred to private ownership.....	30,800.00

There is no evidence that the relative values unfavorable to the Government have changed. There were other land exchanges under the act, all of which were fair and reasonable in value and of far-reaching importance to the mission of the Army in that Territory. All were carefully examined and approved by the War Department.

I have addressed this communication to you, with the hope that you will have it introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should an opportunity for such action be presented.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS,
Secretary of War.

PRISON-MADE GOODS

Mr. ROWBOTTOM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KOPP], who is ill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 7729, an act to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured and produced or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases, may be taken from the Speaker's desk and the Senate amendments agreed to.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What committee does this come from?

Mr. SNELL. From the Labor Committee.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. When the bill was before the House there was some opposition to it, and if there was opposition to it then there may be opposition to a material amendment placed on it in the Senate. I do not see any member of the Labor Committee here.

Mr. SNELL. I think if the gentleman would let the gentleman from Indiana explain it he would find that it is more acceptable to those who made the opposition than it was before.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I can not say as to that, as I do not know what the basis of the opposition was.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I know there was an attempt made to amend the bill in this body to exempt prison farms and the same attempt was made in the other body. What effect this amendment just read has I can not determine by merely listening to it as it was read by the Clerk. Whether it has the effect of exempting from operation of the law things produced on penal farms I can not say. I think the gentleman should let this go over a while, so we can study the effect of the amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Let the gentleman from Indiana explain the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to ask if these amendments have had the consideration of the committee in charge of the bill.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KOPP] called this morning and asked me to have the bill taken from the Speaker's desk and Senate amendments agreed to. He said that the committee was in favor of the amendments. Senator McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate had the amendment in regard to penal farms put on, and it is agreeable to him.

Mr. CRAMTON. What emergency is there for mixing up this bill with a happy Christmas? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. Reserving further the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the Committee on Labor should have a meeting and consider these amendments so that the House can have the benefit of the mature judgment of that committee. The amendments may be all right; I do not know. I feel impelled for the present to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I presented a resolution for the election of Members to certain standing committees in the House. There were two sheets of the resolution. In some way or other one of the sheets failed to reach the reading clerk, so that only a portion of the list was read. I have prepared a new resolution, including the omitted Members, and will send it to the Clerk's desk for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 274

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the standing committees of the House, viz:

FRANKLIN W. FORT, of New Jersey, Committee on Rules.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Committee on Rules.

HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, of California, Committee on the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted my colleague [Mr. TUCKER] until after the recess, on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

POINT OF NO QUORUM

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. GARNER of Texas (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15569, with Mr. LEAVITT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the Members of the House not to interrupt me until I have concluded my remarks, at which time I shall be pleased to answer any questions that may be propounded.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, when Greece was the mistress of the world and Athens the center of all the world's activities it was the custom of the sister republic of Sparta to expose upon Mount Olympus any child that was born into the world that was likely to become a public charge.

There upon that mountain top were left these unfortunate children until the ravages of the tempest and the vultures of the air destroyed their very existence. Since that time civilization has marched slowly onward, upward, and yet progressively forward.

In the year 1215 the barons, the lords, the clergy, and the common people of England wrung from the unyielding bosom of King John at Runnymede that immortal document known as the Magna Charta, or the great charter of rights, giving to the Anglo-Saxon people the inalienable right to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, and, above all, the right to trial by a jury of their peers. Six hundred and fifty years later in this great country of ours that gracious and illustrious President, Abraham Lincoln, signed another immortal document, the Emancipation Proclamation, which forever put a stop to involuntary servitude and brought liberty and freedom to the black race of our country.

The nineteenth century, from 1800 to 1900, will always be remembered as the great era in which intellectual man subjugated the forces of science through the medium of nature to serve the will of man.

What a glorious array of inventive genius this period produced. An era that made it possible for human ingenuity to elaborate and perfect mechanical devices to make human life more congenial and pleasant to live.

Behold the cotton gin of Eli Whitney, the development of the steamboat by Fulton, and of the locomotive by Stevenson. The anguish and pain of the scalpel assuaged by the utilization of anesthesia discovered by Doctor Morton. The miraculous and marvelous contribution of rapid communication through the use of the telephone and telegraph invented by Morse and Bell.

The wonderful entertainment brought about by motion pictures perfected by Edison. The amazing ramification in the field of the wireless and radio invented by that Italian genius, Marconi.

And last but not least the magnificent, epochal accomplishments of the two great Wright brothers in the development of the airplane.

These extraordinary contributions by inventive genius, plus countless other devices, have made it possible for mankind to live happier, healthier, better in our country than was the privilege of our forebears to enjoy ere we came to this world.

In the twentieth century of civilization two men have left their indelible impress upon the hearts and minds of our citizens. One is that aggressive and militant figure, the heroic Theodore Roosevelt; the other is that profound intellectual student of the philosophy of government, the brilliant and scholarly Woodrow Wilson. These two ex-Presidents of the United States have inspired our citizens to think in terms of social justice for the benefit of the great producing classes of our people, and thus put human rights on a parity with property rights.

It was the teachings and the inspirations of their ideals and principles that helped to place upon our statute books in various States of the Union such humanitarian legislation as universal suffrage, widows' pensions, child welfare, workingmen's compensation, employer's liability, the minimum wage laws, the limitation of hours of labor, and last, but not least, the subject of my address, "Old-age pensions," which has been found in operation in every civilized nation of the world with the exception of China, India, and the United States. [Applause.]

What is the purpose of old-age pensions? The fundamental principle behind old-age pensions is the preservation of the home. The home is the unit upon which the superstructure of our Government is reared. If you destroy the home you destroy society and government. The home is the place that symbolizes, to my mind, the monarchical principle of government, in which the father is the king, the mother is the queen, and the children the subjects. In any home wherever you go you will find an inscription upon the wall, "God bless our home." Yea, be it ever so humble, there is no place like home.

The two weakest links in the chain of home life are the young and the old. A generation ago one out of every three or four children born into the world would die ere it had an opportunity to develop into childhood and adolescence. To-day, through the medium of science and medicine, through serum and antitoxins and the countless contributions of prophylactic treatment, coupled with hygienic regulations and legal restrictions placed upon the exploitation of childhood, we are enabled to raise children to the extent that the mortality table shows only one out of eight dying before it had a chance to evolve into young life.

The laws of our country and society have developed the young children of the present generation by prolonging childhood to the age of 16, which is the compulsory educational period required by law.

A soldier fighting in the trenches of France, with bullets and bombs exploding over him, with poisoned gas about him, has a better chance to escape with his life than has a child coming into the world with the desire to live and to reach young adult life.

While we have given the child a better chance to live, thrive, and prosper, scientific medicine has made it possible for mankind to live longer than formerly. Two generations ago the average age of man would be about 40; to-day the average man lives until he is 58, and the same scientific appliances that have been utilized for children to grow and develop have been placed around the old father and the mother, so that old age and longevity have been increased. Formerly, out of a total of 100,000 people, 41,000 would reach the age of 65. To-day 52,000 of such an original number will live to be 65. Because of the increased expectancy of life, the number of persons 65 years of age and over in the United States has been steadily increasing, and the consequences are that while those fathers and mothers are living longer than before the economic and industrial conditions that confront them in our Nation has made it impossible for them to find work, and the only way they can subsist and save themselves from penury, hunger, and want, is for them to join the great caravan that finally wends its way over the hill to the poorhouse and almshouse. [Applause.]

Only 6 per cent of all the old people employed in private industries can expect pensions in their old age, while the balance, or 94 per cent, of them can expect nothing, depending only upon their savings. If, unfortunately, their income did not permit them to save for old age, or they lost their money through unfortunate investments, then modern industry throws them back upon the community as human driftwood and wreckage that is useless for wear and tear. Thus we behold our wage earners transformed from a group of hopeful independent citizens into that of a class of helpless poor. In some States of the Union it is a crime to turn out old horses to starve, still society lets its old men and women starve in their old, unemployed age unless they take the last pilgrimage upon the road that leads them pathetically to the almshouse and poorhouse.

How many old men and women have we? The statistics which were gathered through the State of Massachusetts Old Age Pension Commission show that there were 1,250,000 old fathers and mothers prior to the year 1915 in the United States, all of whom were dependent in part or in whole on public or private charity. And that the Nation's annual cost of our dependent population amounted to over \$200,000,000.

Later estimates of 1927 by Dr. A. Epstein showed almost 2,000,000 dependents maintained in public and private institutions at a total cost of over \$500,000,000.

There are to-day over five and a half million people past 65 years of age in the United States. Two millions are between the age of 65 and 70, a million and a half between the ages of 70 and 75, and a million between 75 and 80, and there are three-

quarters of a million people 80 and over, until life finally terminates. The number of old people in our country is now greater than the original population of the entire 13 colonies. In a study made by the United States Department of Labor in 1925 that investigated 2,183 of these almshouses of the United States, which represent 93 per cent of the total, it was found that in those almshouses there were 85,889 old fathers and mothers who were past the age of 65. The total cost of these almshouses, so far as the land, the buildings, and equipment and the furniture was concerned represented an investment of \$200,000,000.

The total maintenance cost of all these institutions amounted to \$28,740,535, which represented a per capita investment of \$1,752.09 and a food maintenance of \$439.76 for each inmate. Of the 2,183 almshouses studied 1,909, or 87 per cent of them, had less than 100 inmates. To determine how this money was spent study disclosed that 32 per cent went as administrative expense, 38 per cent for operation of the plant, while 30 per cent went for inmates' maintenance. In other words, out of every dollar contributed to the almshouse 70 cents went for administrative and operative expense, the so-called overhead, while 30 cents went directly for the old fathers and mothers.

Every State of the Union, with the exception of New Mexico, has almshouses for the poor. In 40 of our States the almshouses are county institutions. Here in these almshouses are huddled together the feeble-minded and the epileptic, the cripple and the maimed, the idiot and the imbecile, the abandoned child of the prostitute, the broken-down criminal, the chronic drunkard, the victim of loathsome and contagious diseases and venereal infections, and last but not least the superannuated toilers of labor and industry, our fathers and mothers. Veterans of dissipation and veterans of peace and industry living together under one roof. Is it fair? Is it just? Is it humane?

To me it is a pitiful and tragic indictment of the civilization of our times. [Applause.]

What are the causes of old-age dependency? First and foremost is the impairment of health. Sickness and disease exacts a terrible toll. In old age the resistance of a person is diminished and he becomes susceptible very easily to the ravages that come in the wake of vocational and industrial pursuits. Tuberculosis among the miners. Pneumonia amongst the steel and mill and factory workers. Rheumatism and heart lesions from working in damp and wet occupations. Asthma, bronchitis, and skin lesions amongst fur workers. Lead poisoning amongst painters, and countless other maladies too numerous to mention. Unfortunate business investments, alluring advertisements, high-pressure salesmen have ruined many an old father and mother. Bank failures have sent many an elderly couple to the almshouse, when the savings of a lifetime were lost. When the waning earning power of old age in competition with young age and machinery manifests itself, ambition collapses, hope is transformed into despair, and, with relatives and friends gone, death or the almshouse is welcomed as the final relief. The greatest curse of old age, however, is unemployment which has lately increased through the productivity of machinery. Everywhere discrimination is practiced against the older employee in favor of youth. In modern industry today we see the exemplification of the principle "equal opportunity for all, except those past the age of 45."

Another factor driving older men and women toward pauperism is the lack of family connections. One-third of the almshouse paupers throughout the United States have never been married, another third are widowed, and one-third are still married. The great majority of aged dependents in almshouses and infirmaries are childless.

Other causes for dependency are the victims of the ingratitude of children who have forgotten the divine injunction given to Moses upon Mount Sinai, when God gave him the great commandment which says: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

Loss of wife, husband, or children very easily brings about the transition from independence to dependence.

Last but not least the greatest cause of dependency in old age is the terrible toll that industrial accidents take in human and economic values.

During the period from 1910 to 1920, a period of 10 years, there were more men and women maimed and crippled in the industries of the United States than were lost in all the wars of our Nation from the time of the American Revolution down to the World War. In the years 1917 and 1918, when our expeditionary forces went across the ocean to fight to make the world safe for democracy, there were more men and women killed in the industries of our country than there were Ameri-

can soldiers and sailors killed and wounded by the hostile forces fighting in Europe. In the year 1919, according to the report of the Federation of American Engineers, in this country 23,000 people were killed in our industries and 3,570,000 workers were crippled and injured in the performance of their duties, so that they had to stay off for four weeks or more from their employment. If the prevailing rate of wages, according to the National Employers' Association, amounted to \$27.25 per week for the year 1927, it would mean \$4 a day for 300,000,000 days, or a loss to labor and industry of \$1,200,000,000 a year.

It was these frightful conditions, ladies and gentlemen, that prompted the people of this country of ours to interest themselves in the subject of old-age pensions. In 10 years the principle of old-age pensions has been approved in 11 States of the Union. The States of Wisconsin and Montana and the Territory of Alaska to-day are operating under old-age pensions. Eight States have passed legislation on the subject—such States as Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, and in the State of California the legislature passed a bill in favor of old-age pensions, but the governor vetoed it.

In the State of Pennsylvania, where the most thorough investigation upon the subject ever conducted was made, just as the commission was about to put into operation in that great Commonwealth the old-age pension provisions, the supreme court of the State declared the act to be unconstitutional on the ground that the constitution of the State did not permit the contribution of public money to private individuals.

In the State of Arizona, the supreme court also declared the bill unconstitutional because the bill was not properly drafted and its language was too ambiguous.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, 14 States outside of those enumerated have already appointed commissions to investigate the subject of old-age pensions.

I am proud to say that 13 of these States have recommended in toto the principles and ideals upon which old-age pensions are founded.

What do the facts show in the States which have put this system into operation? In the State of Montana and in the State of Wisconsin, when an individual is given the privilege of going to the almshouse or staying in his own home, in every instance the individual prefers to stay in his own home. It costs the counties in Montana \$65.98 a month to take care of an old inmate. You can take care of four men in their own homes for that amount. The average amount of money which these States contribute to the maintenance of an old man in his own home is the sum of \$16. In Pennsylvania it was found that they can take care of three old mothers and fathers in their own homes, for the amount of money that it costs to take care of one person in an institution.

In the States of Montana and Wisconsin it was found that out of every 1,000 in the population no more than a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 3 have sought old-age pensions. The total amount of taxes placed upon each man and woman in the States of Montana and Wisconsin in order to provide comforts for old fathers and for old mothers in their own homes instead of almshouses was the sum of 2 cents a month.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we now come to the subject of old-age pensions in foreign countries. Of all the civilized nations of the world, 42 have adopted the principle of old-age pensions. There are three forms of old-age pensions operating throughout Europe, South Africa, South America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The first is called the compulsory contributory form of old-age pensions. This system consists of compelling each workingman from 16 to 65 to contribute a part of his income to a general national fund, the amount to be contributed being anywhere from 2 to 5 per cent. The employers contribute a like amount, and the Government contributes a third portion. This amount stays in the coffers of the nation until the man becomes old and enfeebled and arrives at the age of 65, when he becomes the beneficiary of his labor and effort. Twenty-eight nations of Europe have adopted the principle of the compulsory contributory form of insurance, and amongst them are the three great nations—England, France, and Germany.

Germany was the first to start this movement, under the influence of the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, in 1889. To-day there are 20,000,000 workers enrolled who, when their time comes, will be the recipients of an old-age pension, which will make them love and respect their fatherland and make them realize that they are receiving the kind of protection and security which it is the duty of every civilized government to provide for its citizens.

Germany also provides its citizens with invalidity insurance, widows and orphans' pensions, as well as sickness and unemployment insurance.

In 1908 that conservative and great nation, England, under the leadership of Lord Asquith, introduced the noncontributory form of insurance. Three years ago greater modifications were made in the bill to conform with Germany's system, so that England to-day stands upon the same pedestal in old-age security legislation as Germany. It adopted in toto the entire theory of compulsory contributory insurance. Out of 17,000,000 workers in England, 16,000,000 have subscribed to the principle of old-age pensions.

France has 7,500,000 of its working people enrolled under the roster of the compulsory contributory form of old-age pensions.

The second system, under which 10 nations operate, is called the noncontributory form of old-age pensions and is colloquially known as the straight pension system. This system provides for no contribution by any toiler, but when a workman arrives at the age of 65 he receives his pension as an evidence of the interest which his government maintains in him. Industry can not throw him away as a wreck, upon the ocean of life.

The nations which have adopted this noncontributory form of old-age pensions, or straight pensions, are such countries as Denmark, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Iceland.

The third form of old-age pensions is the kind known as the voluntary savings type, under which an individual puts away every week in one of the postal savings of the government, a certain amount of money from his allowance and the government contributes a subsidy to equal it. The individual, however, can not use it until he arrives at the age of 65. The nation which started this principle was Spain, and to-day Japan is operating under that system.

There are 1,900,000,000 men and women in this world, and 600,000,000 of them have subscribed to the different forms of old-age pensions. They will be the beneficiaries of an old-age pension system in the declining years of their life. So we have the wholesome spectacle of 42 nations of the world interested in the preservation of human life. The only three nations of the whole world that have not adopted the principle of old-age pensions are China, India, and the United States. I am making the plea to have our country withdraw from the company it is keeping with China and India and march onward with the civilized nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the other day I heard the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, rise in this historic forum and plead the cause of a mighty naval armament, based upon the compact of 5-5-3, by which our country was to emulate the example of England and France in their militaristic standards. When you consider that 15 cruisers, submarines, and battleships that Mr. BRITTEN pleaded for involve expenditures of millions and millions of dollars, I say it is a shame that this the greatest Nation of the world, the most prosperous and at the same time the most civilized country in the world, must build great armaments to match these nations. If we have to prepare in times of peace for war, let us do so. But let us not forget our obligations to the veterans of peace in their hour of need, and so I say if we must match England, France, and Germany, then let it be on the basis of humanitarianism.

If we are to march with these nations along the lines of great naval armaments, we should also march side by side with them to protect our old people as they have protected theirs. The true patriots of our country are not only the men who bared their breasts to shot and shell and were ready to give their lives upon the battle fields of our country, so that our Nation should be preserved, but there are also the veterans of peace, men who have worked in the quarries of life, in season and out of season, and have contributed everything that they hold near and dear in life to the peace and prosperity of our country in times of peace.

Just as we pension the veteran for his patriotism in time of war we should pension through the principle of old-age security the old father and mother who have battled for our happiness and our success in time of peace. [Applause.]

I want to see America marching with England, with France and Germany, not only on the basis of an agreement for naval and military armament but on the basis of humanitarian armament, that would make the world safe for humanity to live in peace, tranquillity, and happiness until Divine Providence calls them to rest in eternal sleep. [Applause.]

Often have I sat in the House and listened to resolutions put through by some of the distinguished men of this historic forum. The other day a bill was passed appropriating \$50,000 to determine why fishes do not enter the harbors of certain sections of our country. Recently another appropriation passed

the House spending thousands of dollars to determine the cause of death of old trees in the forests of our Nation. At the last session of Congress thousands of dollars were appropriated to determine the cause of disease among cattle. I have seen thousands of dollars spent to conserve our oil resources; but this is the first time in the House that I am pleading and asking the distinguished Rules Committee, composed of the most eminent gentlemen of the House, the most powerful group of our membership, to let a bill of mine come out that would appropriate the sum of \$50,000 so that this great Nation of ours may determine the causes of old-age dependency, and to find out how many of our fathers and mothers are in need, and ascertain the best way to take care of the American toiler, so as to protect him in his hour of adversity and misfortune and, above all, when he can no longer work.

This bill has been sleeping quietly in the Rules Committee. It is an American bill. It is a humanitarian bill. It is in consonance and in conformity with the teachings and the preachment of the great Savior. It is in harmony with the greatest commandment of all commandments. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, the time has come, the hour has struck, and the moment has arrived, when the United States has got to declare whether it shall fall behind the cultured and civilized nations of the world or is willing to march side by side with those nations that have put human rights on the same parity as property rights. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we have had 70 Congresses of the United States since the inception of our Government. What man in Congress here can state to me which Congress stands out preeminent? What Member can tell me the Congress that has done the greatest good?

All I know is that the Twelfth Congress was the Congress that declared war against England. The Twenty-ninth Congress was the Congress that declared war against Mexico because of Texas. The Thirty-seventh Congress was the Congress that brought about the Civil War—

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. SIROVICH. In just a moment.

Mr. BOX. The gentleman is cognizant of the fact that Texas had already established her independence?

Mr. SIROVICH. I understand that. Pardon my mistake for the moment.

The Thirty-seventh Congress was the Congress that declared war to free the negro. The Fifty-fifth Congress was the Congress that brought about the freedom of Cuba, which involved us in the Spanish-American War. The Sixty-fifth Congress was the Congress that declared war against the Central Powers of Europe, and the Sixty-third Congress was the Congress that brought about the Federal reserve system that protected the rights of money in banks against financial collapse so that our material wealth would be protected as the years go by.

I would like to see the Seventieth Congress of the United States, ere we make our exodus from this historic forum, declare war against the obsolete treatment of our elders so that they may continue to live in their own homes that have been hallowed with sweet memories, tender with pleasant reminiscences. Home, where the prattle of children has been music to the ears of the parents. Home, that has always been dedicated to God and consecrated to the love of family life.

In the name of humanity I appeal to the membership of this House for the preservation of the home and all that it means, so that the gracious prayers of our older generation will pray for the life and happiness of the membership of the Seventieth Congress of the United States for having given of their to-day that others might have their to-morrow. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall now be pleased to answer any questions that anyone is anxious to ask me.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Does the gentleman's bill propose that this activity shall be carried on by the Federal Government?

Mr. SIROVICH. To answer my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. Box] I would like to say I have put in two bills. One is an old-age security act, a bill that I worked out in conjunction with Prof. Joseph Chamberlain, of Columbia University, that follows the principle of the Smith-Lever Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, the Smith-Sears Act, and the Sheppard-Towner Act.

My bill is designed to have the Government of the United States give a certain sum of money as a contribution to any State that is willing to apply the principle of old-age pensions to its citizens, which is optional with the State to accept. If the State accepts it, it means it has agreed to the minimum requirements given by our country. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Frothingham against Mellon, in which the Sheppard-Towner Act was fought in the Supreme

Court, declared the Sheppard-Towner Act constitutional. The important features of that bill are the same as mine.

The Supreme Court declared there was no involvement of sovereign rights of the States, since the State did not give up its sovereign rights, as it was optional with the State to take the money or not.

Second, that so long as the appropriation was given for the general welfare of all the people, Congress was within its rights.

And, third, there was no jeopardy of property rights of any taxpayer, as the payment of the taxpayer's proportional tax was so small that it did not deprive him of any property rights.

It was upon the basis of this decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that Professor Chamberlain and myself felt that the bill that I have introduced for old-age security in the United States would stand the constitutional test of the Supreme Court.

I am pressing a second bill which I introduced, a bill simply designed to appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to appoint a commission of 15 men, 4 to be appointed by the Speaker from the membership of this House, 4 to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States from the Senate, and 7 to be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 representing capital, 2 representing labor, and 3 disinterested social workers; that they shall have the privilege of gathering together all the available statistics and information, a fact-finding commission, with full powers to subpoena witnesses and records, and then come back and report to us. I bespeak the splendid cooperation of the distinguished Representative of the State of Texas [Mr. Box] and my fellow associates, to talk to the distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. BERTRAND SNELL, one of the finest men we have in this House, and ask him if he will not be kind enough to allow this little resolution to come out, which is simply fact finding in its purpose.

Ladies and gentlemen, just as I was coming in the Chamber—I am glad to see my friend, Mr. SNELL here—I received the following telegram:

The American Association for Old Age Security heartily indorses your great work in behalf of human justice in America. We stand behind you in your efforts and hope that the United States Congress will create a commission to study the present problem of old-age dependency and pensions, so that our Nation in meeting out greater justice to our fathers and mothers, will be placed at least in the same category in which every important and civilized nation in the world is to-day.

This is signed by Bishop Francis J. McConnell, president of the American Association for Old Age Security, and the president of the Federal Council of Protestant Churches of Christ in America, embracing over 22,000,000 Protestants who live in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I want to ask the gentleman what has been done in the State of New York, which was one, if not the pioneer, in workmen's compensation, in the field of old-age pensions?

Mr. SIROVICH. I shall be glad to answer the distinguished gentleman from New York. Seventeen years ago there was appointed a commission in the State of New York known as the commission to inquire into the subject of widows' pensions and other relief for widowed mothers. It was my good fortune to be appointed by the Governor of New York on the original commission. I served with Governor Smith; James J. Walker, the present mayor; ROBERT WAGNER, present United States Senator; Sophia Irene Loeb; Senator Martin McCue; Judge Aaron J. Levy, of the New York Supreme Court; Senator Anthony J. Griffin, and others. The commission worked three years investigating the problem and principle of widows' pensions and child welfare.

In the old days when a father died and left a widow and dependent children behind it was the custom to put the children in an orphan asylum. The mother could see the children once a week for half an hour. The ties that bound a mother to her children were severed. We thought that was an obsolete and inhuman method of treating a widowed mother and her innocent children. We were determined to preserve the home, to unite the family, and to give the money to the mother that we gave to the orphan asylum. This we did in 1913. To-day if a father dies, the children, instead of being taken to an orphan asylum, are put in the custody of the mother. It cost the State of New York more to put the children in an asylum than it did to put them in the custody of the mother. It cost on an average of from \$50 to \$80 to maintain the children in an orphan asylum, whereas it only costs \$20 to maintain these children in the care of their mother. Forty States of the Union have now adopted the principle of widows' pensions and child welfare.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. My question was what progress the movement for old-age pensions is making in the State of New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. There is a commission investigating the subject of old-age pensions in the State of New York which is expected to report at the next session of the legislature. I am proud to tell my friend that Franklin Roosevelt, the newly elected Democratic Governor of the State of New York, has gone on record in favor of old-age pensions; and the principle of old-age pensions was incorporated in the platform of the Democratic Party in New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The workman's compensation act was adopted during the governorship of Charles E. Hughes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I want to correct the distinguished gentleman from New York on that. If I were a lawyer, I would take exceptions to his remark. The gentleman who fathered and sponsored the resolution which brought about the workman's compensation and employers' liability act was a member of a commission appointed by Governor Glynn, of which the present United States Senator, ROBERT WAGNER, was the chairman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I do not desire to bring in anything of a personal nature, but I happened to have been chairman of the State commission on the employers' liability and workman's compensation. We made exhaustive study of the subject and our report and legislation recommended was adopted, and that was in the administration of Governor Hughes.

Mr. SIROVICH. That may be possible; nevertheless the important work that brought the act into full operation was done by ROBERT WAGNER and the factory commission, of which he was the guiding spirit in the person of its chairman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The workman's compensation act was based upon the report of this commission and during the administration of Governor Hughes.

Mr. SIROVICH. When did the act go into effect?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The bill was declared unconstitutional. May I say that the question of the constitutionality of the act was always in doubt. It was known that the constitution might have to be amended.

Mr. SIROVICH. The bill sponsored by Senator WAGNER was never declared unconstitutional.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. But what I say to my friend is that the first act which was passed by the Legislature of the State of New York was in the year 1909 or 1910—before the gentleman entered the legislature.

Mr. SIROVICH. I am glad to take the statement of the gentleman from New York, and will appreciate his kindly cooperation in this cause, so that we Democrats and Republicans may unite together for the common good of the old fathers and mothers of the country.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And I will say that the gentleman has made a very interesting speech.

Mr. SIROVICH. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. In the first session of this Congress, like the gentleman, I introduced a bill along the lines of old-age pensions. Does the gentleman also take into consideration those who are injured in industry, who are disabled, so as not to be able to earn a living?

Mr. SIROVICH. For people who are injured in the performance of their work, as the gentleman has just heard, we have the workman's compensation laws, and the employers' liability laws, and perhaps in time, just as in England, France, and Germany, we will have an all-embracing compulsory-contributory form of old-age pensions to take care of invalidity, injury, and so forth.

Mr. McKEOWN. The old thought was that the States would take a part of this burden, and on the whole that it will be less expensive to the people generally. That is, the States will care for part of this.

Mr. SIROVICH. Exactly.

Mr. McKEOWN. And the National Government will carry part.

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. And that as a whole it will cost less?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes, sir; all students of the subject agree to that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Has the resolution which the gentleman speaks of received a favorable report from a committee?

Mr. SIROVICH. I might tell my distinguished friend from Texas that I wrote a letter to my good friend from New York,

Mr. SNELL, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but I guess that Mr. SNELL has been so busy in other work that he has been engaged in that he has allowed the days to go by without even acknowledging its receipt.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And the resolution is before the Rules Committee?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes; and I think it would be a fine Christmas gift to the old fathers and mothers of our country if we went as a solid phalanx to our good friend, Mr. SNELL, and asked him to be kind enough to allow the Rules Committee to report this innocent resolution of simple fact finding.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What would a lot of our good friends do if they did not have somebody on whom to lay the blame for all of the bad things that happen in Congress?

Mr. SIROVICH. I would not lay any bad thing at the feet of my friend, Mr. SNELL. The gentleman is as fine a gentleman as there is in the Congress.

Mr. SNELL. But always there must be someone to lay everything on, to give us an excuse, and I suppose it might as well be me as someone else.

Mr. SIROVICH. I remind the gentleman that there is an old French proverb which says, that "He who excuses himself, accuses himself."

Mr. SNELL. I do not offer any excuses.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, I shall take this opportunity of thanking the membership of this House for their graciousness and courtesy which they have extended to me while presenting this subject to the American people through this great historic forum. I sincerely trust that as you all go home you may all remain constant in good health, constant in strength and in good deeds, constant in benign influence and human achievement, and that you may all have a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. George W. Wickersham, former Attorney General of the United States under President Taft, to the editor of the New York Times on November 30, 1928.

A HOME FOR THE AGED—AN INSTITUTION MINISTERING TO A PATHETIC AND GROWING NEED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Announcement was made recently that building operations intended to double the capacity of the Home for Old Men and Aged Couples, situated opposite the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, on Amsterdam Avenue, will start shortly. This, in my opinion, is of unusual significance and worthy of especial note by all those interested in the progress of old-age security.

Fifty-six years ago last Sunday a group of members of the Episcopal Church, headed by Bishop Horatio Potter, met and evolved a plan for the founding of a home "where old men and aged couples of known respectability might pass their remaining days in bodily comforts and spiritual privileges and freed from temporal anxieties." Performing a distinguished and humane service for more than a half century, the admirable foresight and broad sympathies of these gentlemen and the wisdom of that policy are only now coming into recognition as the problem of old-age dependency lays increasing claim to public attention.

The recent report of the welfare council, showing that 13,000 aged persons are being cared for in the 82 homes in New York and that another 6,000 are without such care while they remain on an ever-growing waiting list, had a salutary effect on the public mind which was reflected in the widespread comment these figures promoted in the press. That the Home for Old Men and Aged Couples, in advance of this report, should have taken steps not only to keep abreast of this problem, but to anticipate its future requirements, is a singular tribute to the institution itself and to those charged with its direction.

The home to which I refer has taken the lead in providing its residents with not only the necessities of life but also with as many of the comforts and pleasures as possible. The warm and tender atmosphere of a real home has been preserved, the restrictive regulations common to most charitable institutions have been reduced to a minimum, and the peculiarities of old age are recognized and met with sympathetic and intelligent understanding.

I can conceive of no sadder fate than that of the old couple who have faced life's problems together and who have known no greater happiness than the joy of their mutual companionship being forced to separate at the time when they have no one but each other, the man to wither away in an institution for men and the woman to grieve out her heart in a home for women. Experience has shown that one or the other usually passes away after a few months of such separation. The Home for Old Men and Aged Couples is one of the few institutions in New York in which elderly couples may spend their last years together.

As this home has led, I firmly believe other institutions will follow. It is making a noble effort to obtain the \$188,000 necessary to complete

a fund of \$700,000 required for the new building and endowment. A pathetically long waiting list makes it imperative that the fund be in hand by December 15. Contributions should be sent to the Equitable Trust Co. of New York, assistant treasurer, 11 Broad Street, New York City.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM.

NEW YORK, November 30, 1928.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, whatever there may be of impropriety in the remarks I am about to make, I accept full responsibility for, and if there be unwisdom in post-morteming, then the blame is upon my own shoulders. There is no man in the House for whom I have a deeper respect, or who has rendered an abler or more conscientious public service, than the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], who addressed the House last Monday. In view of his devotion to the Democratic Party I can not resist the belief that he did himself a serious injustice in the speech which he made from the floor on that occasion. You know that Democrats have a sort of genius for fratricidal war. There is no Democrat who would not rather stick a knife between the ribs of a fellow Democrat than insert it in the back of our traditional foes. Those who are disgruntled as a result of the outcome of the last election have followed the fashion of taking a pot shot at the chairman of the Democratic National Committee as a vent for their spleen. While I have no belief that he needs defense, I ask the indulgence of the House for a brief survey of his activities, and the activities of the Democratic Party during the recent campaign.

For eight years we have been wobbling along without leadership and without any clearly visioned policy. For the first time in eight years the Democratic Party has had vitality, it has had aggressiveness, it has had that which makes for an intelligent and for an effective campaign leadership. I do not believe that any of us feel that the business man has any monopoly on virtue, or that a man taken from the ranks of business is necessarily holier or more pious than the man who comes from the ranks of politics, yet I do know that we shall be rendering this country a tremendous disservice if we penalize every business man who seeks to render an honorable and disinterested service by criticizing him for those acts which he undertakes solely in the public weal.

I do not know of any campaign which has been conducted on a higher moral level, which had in it less recrimination, mud slinging, and vilification than the campaign conducted under the direction of Chairman Raskob of the Democratic Party. I do not know of any campaign leadership in the history of our party which has been more positive in its convictions or which has presented as clear cut an issue as the one from which we have emerged. Whatever you may say of the leadership it certainly was both courageous and aggressive. Then, too, it supplied the Democratic Party with the sinews of war. [Applause.] I will tell you when a man puts up any money for the Democratic cause it is an act of high faith. The high moral tone was maintained even in the face of a campaign of abuse. I happen to be reasonably familiar with the way this campaign was conducted and being a low and raffish fellow myself I saw no reason why we should not with perfect propriety dispute the citizenship of the President elect, then candidate for office on the Republican ticket. It was, however, contrary to the wishes on the part of the leadership of our party to indulge in anything that might be construed as mud slinging or invoking of unfair tactics. If this be lack of political wisdom, if this be political blundering, we as a party should be proud of the fact that we have blundered at least in the right direction. I heard with profound regret one statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky which I am going to take opportunity to quote:

Kentucky is overwhelmingly Protestant, is overwhelmingly dry, has the smallest per cent of aliens, and even her wets are opposed to wines and beer.

The gentleman can go back to Kentucky and assure his constituents that God still reigns in the heavens, but that He is a dry, Nordic, and strictly Protestant God; that there is no possibility we shall again be plagued with the same situation which arose in this campaign. I believe that any further reference to this troublesome question of religion is something that we should avoid as we would avoid the scurvy. Protestant myself, and the son of a Protestant minister, I feel I can say with perfect propriety that the Catholic Church in this campaign conducted itself with the utmost dignity and restraint. [Applause.]

I will go further and say I do not believe for a moment that the people of Kentucky voted against Governor Smith for the reasons the gentleman from Kentucky has assigned. I believe, while they may have opposed him on the grounds of prohibition, that they were not sufficiently weighed down by intolerance as to have voted on the other ground which he assigned. And may I say now, while I am on this subject, that if a few gentlemen, if a few evangelical clergy whooped themselves into gurgling hysteria, if a few lost their sense of proportion, then it is indubitably true that they are in no sense representative of the intelligent minority of the Protestants of this country, and the sooner we as a people and a party forget about the question of religion the better off we will be. Prohibition? Why should not we have it as an issue? What have we sacrificed by junking some of our obsolete shibboleths and making an issue of a question of vital public concern? For the last eight years our platforms have been an anemic reflection of the Republican platform. We have expounded the doctrine of State rights and have repudiated it whenever it inconveniences or embarrasses us. We invoke the doctrine of State rights to justify our opposition to the child labor laws, and yet when it comes to matters of other human rights we withhold it from proper application.

State rights! It has become the laughing stock of every intelligent and well-informed man and woman in this House to-day. We profess in lush and voluptuous terms to believe in the inviolability of the Constitution of the United States, and—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. And yet, believing in the sanctity of the Constitution as it concerns the eighteenth amendment, we wink at the infraction of other amendments to the Constitution. We as a party have proclaimed our allegiance to the austere policy of not interfering with private business, contending that "that government is best which governs least"; and yet in the face of that profession we accept with rapture every crack-brained idea that is tagged with a humanitarian label and which puts the Government in business in competition with private enterprise.

What has this Congress done, and what has our party done, to redeem our professions and confirm the fundamental and time-honored policy that our Government shall abstain from interference in private business affairs?

What has our party lost in principle by urging new issues? We have changed its ambiguous policy with regard to the tariff. What heretofore has been equivocal has been made positive and clearly stated.

I do not believe that as a party we have surrendered a single important or authentic tenet of faith. Finally we had the courage to accept a candidate who stands for certain specific principles. Let us hope that out of the record there will come a new spirit to our party so that we will interpret in terms of a coherent legislative program our philosophy of government. So far as the Democratic Party is concerned, and so far as the man whom we sought to place in the White House is concerned, they need no defense in this House or in any other forum. They fought a hard and gallant fight. We Democrats, instead of backbiting and snarling and expressing our bitterness over the catastrophe, ought to take pride in the fact that it was a good fight, valiantly waged, and fought under gallant leaders. [Applause.]

Mr. BUSBY. Does the gentleman stand as the spokesman of the Democratic Party now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BUSBY. I understood you condemned the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], who spoke the other day, and that you speak for the party.

Mr. COMBS. No; I am not so presumptuous.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken suggest a very alluring subject, but I do not rise to indulge in any postelection diagnosis. I rise for the purpose of making a few additional observations upon what I think is a great national question, which I discussed briefly in this House a few

days ago, namely, the basis of representation of the various States in this body.

Yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] put into the RECORD a letter from a certain gentleman from New York in the effort, apparently, to inject into this question the wet and dry issue and the religious question. It seems to me unfortunate that there is scarcely a question discussed on this floor but some gentleman with a wet and dry complex thinks he must interject that question into the proceedings. I do not think that the apportionment question has anything to do with the wet and dry question or with the question of religion.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Nothing was said about the religious issue.

Mr. HOCH. The gentleman said this came from Protestant sources and stressed that point and then sought to bring in certain other organizations in this country in an effort to becloud the issue. So far as I know, there has been no propaganda of the sort suggested. I have no knowledge whatever as to the attitude of any of the organizations mentioned. I have no sympathy whatever with the injection of prohibition or religion into this question. But let us get at the merits, which some gentlemen seem to wish to avoid.

Let me discuss another phase of the question which I did not have the time the other day to go into fully. The question I raised is whether it is reasonable and right that any State in this Union should have an increase in membership in this House solely for the reason that there is within the boundary of that State a large body of aliens—that is, unnaturalized foreign born.

I raised the question whether it is reasonable or right that the vote of any State in this Union should be increased upon this floor upon any one of the great American questions that arise, including even a declaration of war, solely because of the fact that there is in that State a great body of aliens. I assert that by every test of logic, of governmental theory, and of sound Americanism the answer to that question must be in the negative.

I now propound a second inquiry, which I did not get time to discuss the other day. What is it? It is a question, I think, of equal or even greater importance. Is it reasonable, is it right, that the electoral vote of any State in this Union in the election of a President of the United States should be increased solely by the fact that there are within that State a great body of aliens; that is, unnaturalized foreign born? Of course, all who are familiar with our Constitution understand that the electoral vote of any State is determined by the total of the number of Senators and Members of the House from that State. Let me give you an illustration. Suppose in the recent election Herbert Hoover or Governor Smith had been elected by an electoral vote of one majority. What would that mean, so far as this proposition is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOCH. It is difficult to cover this in such a short time. I called attention to the fact that upon the basis of the 1920 census a reapportionment, excluding aliens from the count, would mean a shifting of nine electoral votes from five States. Therefore if either Herbert Hoover or Governor Smith had been elected by a majority of one in the Electoral College, counting the votes of these five States, that would mean that if the aliens had been excluded from the basis of representation in any one of these five States it would have changed the presidential result.

Now, the gentleman from New York the other day said that this situation would cure itself, after denying that there was any situation that needed to be cured. I deny that proposition. The record of our history shows that it does not cure itself. This is no new question. Let me say in passing that I never heard of the proposal of the New York gentleman whose letter was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, and frankly am not interested in his contention that he is the originator of the idea. Of course, anyone familiar with American constitutional history knows that it is absurd for anyone now living to claim that he originated the idea that aliens should not be counted in making congressional apportionment. In introducing my resolution the other day I certainly made no such claim and had never heard of this New York gentleman's proposal. I am led to say this by the resentment I feel that anyone on either side should inject outside issues into a discussion of this sort. So much for that.

I was calling attention a few moments ago to the result that might happen in any presidential election by the inclusion of aliens in the count. I do not believe there will be any census

for many years, if ever, where the exclusion of the aliens would not shift at least 5 to 10 electoral votes from States where such votes are based on alien population to other States where they would be based on citizen population. And the shifting of just one electoral vote might mean a different presidential result, just as in the House it might mean a different decision on matters of vast importance.

I assert again on this second proposition that by every test of a sound theory of government and of American doctrine the election of a President of the United States should rest entirely upon a foundation of citizenship, and not upon a foundation of foreign or divided allegiance. [Applause.]

I am not at the moment discussing the matter of suffrage. Any student of the Constitution—and, of course, that includes us all—knows that the matter of suffrage, outside the limitations in the Constitution, principally the fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth amendments, still resides within the individual States and is not a matter of Federal jurisdiction. But that is aside from what I am discussing. I am discussing the sole question of whether the residence of aliens in a State, not citizens either by birth or naturalization, should have such a far-reaching effect not only upon the membership of this body, but upon the vastly important matter of the election of a President of the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not assuming to discuss the merits of the gentleman's proposition, but what does he think about the provision in the Constitution which provide that—

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.

Mr. HOCH. If the gentleman had been present the other day he would know that I discussed that and discussed it upon the basis of the constitutional amendment which I have offered in the House, which proposes to add to the very sentence the gentleman reads the two words "and aliens," so that aliens would be excluded as a basis of representation in this body.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I regret that I did not hear the gentleman's former statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOCH. There are many angles to this proposition, and I do not want to impose upon the House too much. However, I want to call attention, as briefly as I can, to a matter of American history. When the Constitution was framed we had no uniform naturalization laws. The Constitution provided a grant of power to the Federal Government, to enact a uniform naturalization law.

The different States had a different basis of naturalization as well as a different basis of suffrage, and so it was impracticable at the time the Constitution was adopted to exclude aliens from the count. However, as the years went on the question assumed increased importance, and at the time of the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, following the Civil War, it is interesting to know that the same question I am presenting was debated upon the floor of this House. I have before me a speech made by Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, on January 31, 1866. He, as the spokesman of the House Members on the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, which was appointed after the war, and was the committee from which came the fourteenth amendment and some other measures, discussed this question, and I want to read just a sentence or two from his statement. I now quote:

If I have been rightly informed as to the number, there are from 15 to 20 Representatives in the Northern States founded upon those who are not citizens of the United States. In New York, I think, there are three or four Representatives founded upon the foreign population, three certainly. And so it is in Wisconsin, Iowa, and other Northern States.

Now, listen. He says further:

Let us try to be practical. On the 5th day of December last I introduced a proposition to amend the Constitution founding representation upon the voting basis and excluding the foreign population, as the proposition of my friend from Ohio does. It was dear to my heart, for I have been gestating it for three months. [Laughter.] But when I came to consult the Committee of Fifteen and found that the States would not adopt it, I surrendered it.

In other words, he surrendered not as a matter of principle, but solely for the very practical reason that he found upon his

committee of 15 he did not have enough votes to get the proposal out of the committee, all of which sounds very modern in the light of certain discussions we have had from time to time in this House.

I rest the proposition again solely upon this sound governmental doctrine, as I believe it to be: The basis of representation in the popular branch of Congress should be upon a basis of citizenship and not upon a basis of alien population.

Think of it! Here we have in the State of New York, by way of illustration, four electoral votes and in Massachusetts two votes cast upon the election of the President of the United States solely because there are several million aliens in those States. And so with the other States where the seven or eight million aliens in America principally reside. And yet the great body of American citizens in Alaska are without any vote at all in the Electoral College. We have the District of Columbia with its citizens, we have in the Territory of Hawaii, American citizens, and they have no voice in this House and no voice in the election of a President of the United States. But as a result of this thing which I do not believe can be squared by any sound governmental reasoning, we have nine votes in this House, nine votes in the Electoral College, based solely upon the existence of large alien populations in a few States. The 1930 census may show an even greater inconsistency.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not reasonable to assume that the members of the Constitutional Convention presumed there would be no large body of foreigners come to this country and remain for a long period of years without becoming citizens?

Mr. HOCH. I think it is fair to assume that, and as I said a moment ago, it is easy to understand when the new Government was being formed, when the States had all the various differences with reference to naturalization and there was no uniformity, that it was impracticable at that time to exclude the aliens from the count. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, to my mind there is danger of the passage of a so-called farm relief bill, which will be only a delusion and a snare. The farmers are entitled to a good bill. While we are about it let us pass a real farm relief measure. Will the so-called stabilization corporations set up under the proposed farm board render a real service to the farmers? Well, maybe so, but I doubt it. At Government expense and with Government aid it will add a few more gigantic speculators to the already overcrowded field of middlemen.

There is danger of the creation of great concerns which will buy larger amounts of farm products from the farmers at low prices and elevate prices, if at all, after most of the particular commodity is out of the hands of the real producers. The farmers' products eventually sell for a good price, but the enhancement is after they leave the hands of the farmer, and not enough of the real value of the products is received by the farmer.

I want farm relief for the individual farmer and for all farmers and not for those who possess the farmers' products after he has lost the ownership of them. The farmers need legislation which will enable each and all of them to hold their products off the market and sell them only when there is a reasonable demand for them at a fair price.

Let us pass a bill which will help the poorest of the poor as much as it will help the richest of the rich, and which will enable the small producer to hold his commodity until there is a good price and he shares in the benefits of the legislation. I brand as unfair and vicious any bill that provides for the establishment of a corporation or corporations with public funds to be used in exploiting the farmer of small means who is not able to hold his commodity for a better price.

I certainly hope there will be no serious effort to pass any such bill. Let us pass legislation so definite and helpful in its terms that each farmer who has for sale a bale of cotton, a few pounds of tobacco, or other commodity, will understand fully the exact financial benefit he is receiving therefrom.

It is clear to my mind that this can only be done to the fullest extent by the creation of a Government agency with power and capital to help all and every producer of cotton or tobacco, for instance, hold their commodities until there is a demand for them and then sell them in wholesale quantities at a fair price. The farmers will never get a fair price for their products as long as they are rushed on the market, as cotton and tobacco are sold in my section at the present time.

It is a tragedy for tobacco to be sold at a sacrifice, such as I saw so many times last summer, when it should have netted the

farmers, in many instances, more than twice what they received. This thing must stop and I, for one, will not approve or be content with a bill which is only a makeshift and does not render real personal relief to the producers of the country. The farmers' problem can be permanently solved by the Government offering to help them get a square deal, provided the farmers give a square deal to themselves and to the Government.

I have a bill pending which will provide for this sort of thing, and I propose making myself heard often and fully concerning this bill during the next few months.

We have just passed a bill to construct the great Boulder Canyon Dam across the Colorado River. Why? Simply because the people to be benefited are to do certain things in return, so as to make desirable the expenditure. Great irrigation projects are undertaken because it is made clear that the Government is to render a certain service and receive in return a commensurate service. All great enterprises, private and public, are undertaken for the same reason. Therefore, why not the Government say to the farmers, "We will make you independent, enable you to name within reason the price of the products of your toil, and place you on a parity with other businesses and enterprises, provided you will in return by proper organization control your production and marketing?"

My bill goes into detail as to how this can be done, and later I hope to discuss it more fully with individual Members, before the committees, and on the floor of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which conducted the hearings on the bill now before you for your consideration (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary, and the Departments of Commerce and Labor take pleasure in informing you that they have examined with unusual care this year the requirements of these four great departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and the recommendations presented to you in the form of this bill represent the committee's best judgment. In this connection, I think it apropos at this time to state that the membership of the subcommittee handling this bill has been intact for the past six years, and, year after year, their interest, instead of flagging, has only increased, and I take this occasion to congratulate and compliment my confreres, Messrs. ACKERMAN, OLIVER of Alabama, TINKHAM, and GRIFFIN for the wonderful spirit of help, co-operation, and advice that has always been manifest during all these years of committee association.

In discussing the bill with you this afternoon, I shall dwell briefly on the figures for the bill as a whole and endeavor to give you a picture of the action taken by the committee in figures covering the four departments combined and then shall be glad to discuss the recommendations covering the more important features of each department separately.

The total appropriations under which these departments are now operating during this present fiscal year, 1929, is \$90,573,935.89. The committee examined estimates for the next fiscal year amounting to \$111,874,347.43, and the total of the bill recommended by this committee for the conduct of these departments for the next fiscal year, 1930, is \$111,772,887.43. This represents a gross increase of \$21,198,951.54 over the current year, and a decrease of \$101,460 under the Budget estimates.

The total increase in the bill for 1930 over 1929, which, if I may repeat, is \$21,198,951.54, standing by itself would be indicative of numerous increases of considerable importance, but, as a matter of fact, the amount is a net increase accounted for very largely by consideration of four factors, namely: The amendment to the classification act of 1923, passed at the last session (Welch Act), the special act increasing the pay of immigration inspectors, the presence in the bill of the largest of the increments of appropriation for the taking of the Fifteenth Census, and the elimination from the bill of a number of appropriations for the fiscal year 1929 which do not recur for the fiscal year 1930.

The increase in the bill for the four departments on account of the Welch Act is \$2,754,374, and the increase on account of the pay of immigration inspectors is \$244,620, making the bill carry on account of pay increases authorized at the last session, \$2,998,994. The increase carried on account of the largest of the increments for the Fifteenth Census is \$16,951,800. The non-recurring 1929 items account for a decrease of \$2,521,200. Considering these broad factors of increase or decrease between 1929 and 1930 and eliminating them from consideration, the net increase of 1930 over 1929 on all other items for the four departments is \$3,776,357.54. I am inserting a table at this point of the RECORD which shows these factors of difference graphically set forth for each department and in the aggregate:

Department	Appropriations for 1929, including sums in deficiency act	Budget estimates, 1930	Amount recommended in bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
State.....	\$14,325,003.39	\$14,603,598.43	\$14,600,478.43	+\$275,475.04	-\$3,120.00
Justice.....	26,808,062.50	28,103,570.00	27,937,370.00	+1,129,307.50	-166,200.00
Commerce.....	38,372,530.00	68,456,749.00	58,519,609.00	+20,147,079.00	+62,880.00
Labor.....	11,068,340.00	10,710,430.00	10,715,430.00	-352,910.00	+5,000.00
Total.....	90,573,935.89	111,874,347.43	111,772,887.43	+21,198,951.54	-101,460.00

REALLOCATION OF POSITIONS

The committee recommends in the bill a paragraph similar to that included in the Interior Department appropriation bill and approved by the House permitting transfers between bureau or office appropriations to meet increases of compensation resulting from the reallocation of positions by the Personnel Classification Board pursuant to the classification act of 1923. It frequently happens that after the annual appropriations have been made reallocations are approved by the board adding burdens to the appropriations that could not be foreseen at the time they were under preparation in the departments or under consideration in the Budget Bureau and in Congress, and the paragraph included in the bill is to enable the departments to meet such contingencies without upsetting the allocations of funds that were made prior to the certification of any such reallocations. The committee is of the opinion that that paragraph will be an effective aid in administration and at the same time is sufficiently safeguarded to prevent any possible abuse in its operation.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

I shall give you now the changes and recommendations in connection with Title I of the bill, the Department of State.

We have recommended for the department a total of \$14,600,478.43, which is an increase of \$275,475.04 over the current appropriations and a decrease of \$3,120 under the Budget estimates. In the appropriations for 1929 there were items aggregating the sum of \$693,000 which will not be required in 1930 and which, therefore, have been omitted from the estimates for that year, thus leaving an amount equivalent to this sum for new items and increases in other items for 1930, which, together with the increase of \$275,475.04 over the appropriations for 1929 gives an aggregate of \$968,475.04 for new items and increases for the fiscal year 1930, of which \$115,720 is due to the Welch Act.

Group	Appropriations, 1929 (including second deficiency act of 1928)	Budget estimates, 1930	Amount recommended for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
(1) Department in Washington, including passport bureaus.....	\$1,462,365.00	\$1,685,955.00	\$1,692,835.00	+\$230,470.00	+\$6,880.00
(2) Foreign Service.....	9,374,600.00	9,214,640.00	9,214,640.00	-159,960.00	-----
(3) Foreign Service buildings and retirement funds.....	1,513,000.00	2,216,000.00	2,216,000.00	+703,000.00	-----
(4) International obligations.....	1,916,288.39	1,429,753.43	1,419,753.43	-496,534.96	-10,000.00
(5) Judicial.....	58,750.00	57,250.00	57,250.00	-1,500.00	-----
Total, regular annual appropriations.....	14,325,003.39	14,603,598.43	14,600,478.43	+\$275,475.04	-\$3,120.00
(6) Permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	141,233.00	141,233.00	141,233.00	-----	-----
Grand total.....	14,466,236.39	14,744,831.43	14,741,711.43	+\$275,475.04	-\$3,120.00

SALARIES, SECRETARY'S OFFICE

The committee has recommended a total of \$1,340,000 for the salary appropriation under the Secretary's office, an increase of \$194,240 over the current year and a decrease of \$9,820 under the amount recommended in the Budget estimates. The increase in the salaries for the Department of State resulting from the Welch Act, exclusive of the fund "Immigration of

aliens," accounts for \$108,220 of the increase carried in the bill. The balance is made up of new positions in the treaty division, index bureau, publications division, and stenographic section, and the replacement of two Foreign Service officers as chiefs of the Mexican affairs division and Latin American affairs division by civilian appointments.

The estimates contained a recommendation for the increase in the salary of the Undersecretary of State from \$8,000 to \$12,000 to conform to the action recommended in the Budget increasing the salaries of the Undersecretary of the Treasury, the Solicitor General, the Director of the Budget, and the Comptroller General, each from \$10,000 to \$12,000. General committee action having eliminated all these increases from \$10,000 to \$12,000, the two applicable to this bill are accordingly rejected. The committee, however, in the case of the Undersecretary of State recommends that the salary be increased from \$8,000 to \$10,000, to be comparable with the present salary paid to the other official positions with which it is classified in importance. The present incumbent of the position of Undersecretary of State is a recent appointee and under the operation of the restriction on promotions under the "average" provision he was necessarily placed at \$8,000, the minimum salary of his grade, which carries rates of \$8,000, \$8,500, and \$9,000. His salary at the present time is \$1,000 lower than that of the other Assistant Secretaries of State, whom he outranks, and each of whom receives \$9,000. The committee, therefore, feels that in real justice to the present situation the salary should be made \$10,000 per annum.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

The amount recommended for contingent expenses for the department in Washington is \$70,705, an increase of \$17,100 over the current year and an increase of \$15,000 over the Budget estimates. The committee allowed \$5,000 additional for a new automobile for the Secretary's office, to be immediately available, and the balance of the increase will be used in providing additional equipment, furniture and fixtures for the department, some additional desks, and the replacement of worn-out typewriters and equipment.

PRINTING AND BINDING

The appropriation for printing and binding recommended for 1930 is \$210,000, an excess of \$10,000 over the expenditures estimated for the current year, the major portion of which is to be expended in an endeavor to carry out the department's schedule in bringing its issues of Foreign Relations current. I might say right here that there are now several volumes in various stages of preparation, and the department is working upon a program which contemplates the publication of a total of 27 volumes by June 30, 1934, which will cover all of the diplomatic correspondence down to and including the year 1927.

PASSPORT BUREAU

We have recommended for the passport agencies of the department in the United States a total of \$72,130, an increase of \$9,130 over the current year and an increase of \$1,700 over the Budget estimates. Of this difference, \$4,860 represents the increase caused by the Welch Act, \$2,570 for additional personnel of two employees, and, in addition, \$1,700 for electrifying the sealing press and the purchase of machines to be used in connection with affixing photographs to passports that will greatly help in eliminating fraudulent transfers of pictures on passports.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES

We have included in the bill the Budget estimate of \$1,063,000 for contingent expenses at the United States consulates, an increase of \$28,000 over the 1929 figure. Increases in rentals at some of the consulates abroad account for \$7,000 of this increase. In order to protect passports and to prevent illegal entry into the United States of alien applicants for visas, it was found desirable that some means of marking passports and visas to prevent counterfeits and fraud should be adopted. A "protectograph" has been found which will serve this purpose, and a sufficient number to supply the various offices can be obtained at a cost approximating \$9,500. The balance that goes to make up the increase of \$28,000 will be used for furniture, furnishings, and labor-saving devices.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS FUND

As the House will no doubt recall, Congress has appropriated, under section 4 of the act approved May 7, 1926, for the acquisition of buildings and grounds for the use of the Government in foreign countries a total of \$2,435,000, from which expenditures have been made amounting to \$1,661,569.20. The Foreign Service Buildings Commission has decided upon projects which will call for an expenditure during the fiscal year 1929 amounting to a total of \$1,784,265.33. Thus, not only will all of the unexpended balance of existing appropriations be required, but the appropriation for expenditure during the present fiscal year

of an additional sum of \$1,010,834.53. The projects mentioned and others decided upon by the commission will require an expenditure of \$1,425,815.78 during the fiscal year 1930. In addition to this amount the commission has practically decided upon one important project which will cost not less than \$1,000,000 and have in contemplation the authorization of other projects costing approximately \$2,200,000. It is expected that at its approaching meeting the commission will definitely decide upon the acquisition of the last-named properties. This will make outstanding projects to be financed amounting in all to \$3,625,815. It will therefore be necessary, so that the work of the commission may continue unabated, to appropriate \$2,000,000 for the next fiscal year. This amount has been recommended by the committee.

MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GERMANY, AND UNITED STATES, AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY

The appropriation for the current year for this commission is \$178,762. The amount in the bill for 1930 is \$132,927, a decrease of \$45,835. There has been presented to the German Claims Commission a total of 12,425 claims, aggregating approximately \$1,479,000,000. Of this number all of the claims have been disposed of except 203. Of these 203, the decision on 57 will determine the remainder of them, work on which it is expected will be finished by the end of this fiscal year. With reference to the Austrian and Hungarian claims, known as the tripartite claims, there have been presented 1,631 cases, of which number all have been disposed of except 149, and it is expected that these will be settled by the end of the present fiscal year. In the settlement of war claims act, passed at the last session, the President was asked to negotiate with Germany for an extension of the commission's jurisdiction to include the consideration of claims that were filed after April 9, 1923, which, under the original agreement, was the date when all claims had to be filed. The President has submitted the proposition to the German Government, which has taken it under consideration. While nothing definite is known as yet it is anticipated that the German Government will acquiesce in the extension of the jurisdiction of the commission to these additional cases, of which there are 5,889. The estimate approved by the committee is to continue the work of the commission for another year in the event of the presentation to it of these additional cases.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The total appropriation we have recommended for the Department of Justice and the judiciary is \$27,937,370. This is a reduction of \$166,200 under the Budget estimates. The current appropriations of the department total \$26,808,062.50. The recommendations which I have mentioned, therefore, are \$1,136,307.50 more for 1930 than for 1929. The increases allowed under the application of the Welch Act account for \$771,774 of this increase. In addition to the Welch Act salary increase, there is also an increased amount of \$65,500 for salaries of judges. The balance of the department's larger increases are \$107,500 in the item for marshals and their deputies, \$86,000 in the fund for district attorneys, \$93,400 for regular assistants to district attorneys, \$123,000 for clerks of courts, and a total increase for the different Federal penal and correctional institutions of \$395,321.

Object	Appropriations, 1929	Budget estimates, 1930	Amount recommended in the bill, 1929	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
Department of Justice proper	\$4,443,050.00	\$4,684,790.00	\$4,675,590.00	+232,540.00	-\$9,200.00
Judicial	16,839,702.50	17,441,149.00	17,341,149.00	+501,446.50	-100,000.00
Penal and correctional institutions	5,525,310.00	5,977,631.00	5,920,631.00	+395,321.00	-57,000.00
Total	26,808,062.50	28,103,570.00	27,937,370.00	+1,129,307.50	-166,200.00

SALARIES, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

In the office of the Attorney General, or, I might say, for the salary roll covering the majority of positions in the Department of Justice in Washington for legal work, we have recommended a total of \$1,228,300. This is an increase of \$121,400 over the current figure and a decrease of \$9,200 under the 1930 Budget estimate. The increase for 1930 is due in the main to Welch Act increases, amounting to \$97,000, and the transfer of two positions from an appropriation heretofore carried separately entitled "Enforcement of acts to regulate commerce." In addition there is an increase in positions of two attorneys and one stenographer to aid in increased taxation work.

PROTECTING INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1928

We have recommended \$75,000 for protecting the interests of the United States which work grew out of the settlement of the war claims act of 1928. This act provided that as to certain German ships which had been taken over, and radio stations, and for certain situations with reference to patents, an arbiter should be appointed who should make certain determinations and awards. There were 1,181 claims filed before the arbiter: 1,081 being patent claims, involving 6,201 patents, and 440 trade-marks. This work of presenting the United States' side of the claims is now progressing, and it is estimated by the legal division in charge of the ship litigation and also the division in charge of the patent litigation, that it can not be completed prior to January 1, 1930, and possibly will continue for several months after that date. The estimate is based upon the theory that it will be necessary to continue substantially a force of 16 attorneys and 4 stenographers for a period of at least six months during the fiscal year 1930. The appropriation has been made immediately available so that it may be used to reimburse the regular appropriations for the fiscal year 1929 to the extent that they have been used for this claim work. We have inserted a clause in the bill limiting the salary of any individual paid out of this fund to \$9,000.

PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

As the House no doubt knows, the Federal Government, under the Department of Justice, has six penal and correctional institutions; namely, the penitentiaries at Leavenworth, Atlanta, and McNeil Island, the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va., the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, and the National Training School for Boys at Washington, D. C. The total we have recommended for the conduct of these institutions (including also the probation system, support of prisoners in other than Federal institutions, and the inspection of prisons and prisoners) amounts in the aggregate to \$5,920,631. This is an increase over the current year of \$395,321, and is accounted for in the main by increased personnel and maintenance costs due to the steadily increasing populations at these different places of incarceration.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

We have recommended for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1930 a total of \$58,519,609, an increase of \$20,147,079 over the current year and an increase of \$62,860 over the Budget estimates. There is recommended \$19,000,000 for the largest increment of the appropriations for the taking of the Fifteenth Census, which represents an increase of \$16,951,800 over the current census appropriations. The increase involved on account of the Welch Act is \$1,343,760. The 1929 appropriations contained items totaling \$512,200, which do not recur for 1930. Taking into consideration the increase on account of the Welch Act, the Fifteenth Census, and the decrease on nonrecurring items, the remainder of the items for the department show a net increase of \$2,363,719, which is largely accounted for by additions under the aeronautics branch, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and the Bureau of Fisheries.

Bureau	Appropriations, 1929	Budget estimates, 1930	Amount recommended in bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
Secretary's office.....	\$7,181,950	\$9,354,460	\$9,320,820	+\$2,138,870	-\$33,640
Foreign and Domestic Commerce.....	4,257,357	4,436,423	4,524,923	+267,566	+88,500
Census.....	2,048,200	19,000,000	19,000,000	+16,951,800	-----
Steamboat Inspection.....	1,114,060	1,187,220	1,187,220	+73,160	-----
Navigation.....	330,880	352,040	352,040	+21,160	-----
Standards.....	2,246,055	2,506,746	2,506,746	+260,691	-----
Lighthouses.....	11,145,250	11,349,980	11,349,980	+204,730	-----
Coast and Geodetic.....	2,404,535	2,515,860	2,515,860	+111,325	-----
Fisheries.....	2,010,748	2,170,550	2,178,550	+167,802	+8,000
Patent.....	3,091,415	3,333,800	3,333,800	+242,385	-----
Mines.....	2,542,080	2,249,670	2,249,670	-292,410	-----
Total.....	38,372,530	58,456,749	58,519,609	+20,147,079	+62,860

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

I call your attention to the fact that for the department's contingent and miscellaneous expense fund the bill carries a total of \$290,000, which, when there is taken into account a transfer of \$33,100 formerly carried in this lump-sum amount to the Bureau of the Census's regular \$19,000,000, represents an

increase of just the amount of the transfer. This increase has been allocated generally to the different bureaus in the department.

PRINTING AND BINDING

The same I might say is true of the printing and binding item, where a transfer of \$114,000 has been made and the fund reduced by only \$100,000, showing a net increase to the department of \$14,000.

THE AERONAUTICS BRANCH

I know the House will be very much interested in the 1930 program for commercial airways and the wonderful work that has been done and is contemplated by the department along this line. Since the establishment of the aeronautics branch of the department under the air commerce act of 1926 appropriations therefor have been made in two separate funds, "Aircraft in commerce" and "Air navigation facilities." I shall explain the program under each one of these heads separately. First, for aircraft in commerce the appropriation recommended of \$935,000 covers expenses of administration and the cost of the following special work required by the air commerce act:

1. The inspection and licensing of aircraft; the examination and licensing of pilots and mechanics; the enforcement of the air-traffic rules; the inspection and rating of airports; and other regulatory functions.
2. The dissemination of information relative to commercial aeronautics; the promotion of trade; and the encouragement of local governments in the establishment of air ports.
3. Research and experimentation looking to the improvement of materials used in the construction of airplanes; the testing of new types of aircraft engines and propellers.
4. The mapping of civil airways.

The amount allowed by us for 1930 for these activities is an increase over the current year of \$160,500.

Activity	1929 appropriations	1930 Budget estimates	1930 committee recommendations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), recommendations over appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), recommendations under estimates
Administration.....	\$58,400	\$63,880	\$63,880	+\$5,480	-----
Air regulations.....	476,200	705,730	672,090	+195,890	-\$33,640
Air information.....	41,500	44,380	44,380	+2,880	-----
Airway mapping (Coast and Geodetic Survey).....	18,400	21,200	21,200	+2,800	-----
Research (Bureau of Standards).....	125,000	60,000	60,000	-65,000	-----
Purchase of airplanes.....	55,000	55,000	55,000	-----	-----
Welch Act increases.....	-----	18,450	18,450	+18,450	-----
	774,500	968,640	935,000	+160,500	-33,640

¹ This is not a decrease but a transfer of this amount to the fund "Air navigational facilities."

This increase is distributed as follows:

Administration: There has been recommended under this heading an increase of \$5,480. This is for additional office employees, made necessary by the large increase in the work of the Washington office. The additional employees will be assigned to the administrative section, which has charge of the mail and files, accounts, and other similar routine office matters.

Air regulations division: An increase of \$195,890 has been carried in the bill over 1929. This is intended to cover the personnel and equipment to establish a licensing unit on the west coast; the salaries of 20 field clerks for assignment to headquarters of inspection districts, and rent and equipment of field district headquarters offices; salaries and traveling expenses of additional airplane, engine, and factory inspectors, maintenance and operating expenses of additional airplanes requested; purchase of special flying equipment, and some additional clerical help in Washington. The committee decreased the Budget estimate somewhat, it being of the opinion that the estimate for additional inspectors was somewhat excessive.

Airway mapping section: The increase of \$2,800 is for the salary of an additional topographic draftsman.

Aeronautical research division: The apparent decrease of \$65,000 is due to the fact that items for research in connection with radio communication, lighting, and other aids to air navigation have been estimated for under the heading "Air navigational facilities."

AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

The second appropriation which I wish to discuss briefly is to cover the actual setting up, establishing, and maintaining of the civil airways, equipped with intermediate landing fields, boundary and beacon lights, telegraphic, telephonic, and radio communications, and weather reporting service. We have rec-

ommended for this purpose for 1930 a total of \$5,458,620, an increase over 1929 of \$798,770. The recommendation I have just called your attention to will maintain 11,500 miles of airways at \$195 a mile and 44 radio stations at \$12,000 per annum, and in addition will construct 3,900 miles of additional airways at \$315 a mile and construct 19 additional radio stations at \$24,000 each.

Expenditures	Fiscal year 1929	Fiscal year 1930
Administration:		
Salaries, departmental service.....	\$65,360	\$72,540
Salaries, field service.....	272,750	275,000
Travel and subsistence.....	162,700	170,000
Office expenses and supplies.....	28,700	34,000
Operation of airplanes.....	75,000	21,643
Total, administration.....	604,510	573,183
Maintenance:		
Lighted airways—		
Fiscal year 1929, 7,512 miles, at \$195 per mile.....	1,464,840	
Fiscal year 1930, 11,500 miles, at \$195 per mile.....		2,242,500
Radio stations—		
Fiscal year 1929, 24 radio stations, at \$12,000 per annum.....	288,000	
Fiscal year 1930, 44 radio stations, at \$12,000 per annum.....		528,000
Total maintenance.....	1,752,840	2,770,500
Construction and maintenance on additional airways:		
Fiscal year 1929, construction of 4,000 miles, at \$315 per mile.....	1,260,000	
Maintenance, 4,000 miles, 6.5 months, at \$195 per mile.....	422,500	
Fiscal year 1930, construction of 3,900 miles, at \$315 per mile.....		1,228,500
Maintenance, 3,900 miles, 4 months, at \$195 per mile.....		285,187
Radio beacon and communication stations, construction and maintenance:		
Fiscal year 1929, construction of 20 stations, at \$24,000 each.....	480,000	
Maintenance of 20 stations for 7 months, at \$12,000 per annum.....	140,000	
Fiscal year 1930, construction of 19 stations, at \$24,000 each.....		456,000
Maintenance of 19 stations for 5 months, at \$12,000 per annum.....		95,000
Total, new construction and maintenance.....	2,302,500	2,064,687
Research and experimental work:		
Salaries, departmental service.....		10,000
Salaries, field service.....		15,000
Travel and subsistence.....		10,000
Purchase of supplies and equipment.....		15,250
Total, research and experimental.....		50,250
Grand total.....	4,659,850	5,458,620

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

We increased the Budget figures in several instances for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce by an amount totaling \$88,500. This gives the bureau, including a \$20,000 increase contained in the Budget, a net increase over 1929 of \$108,500, which is exclusive of the Welch Act increases. The increases are as follows:

Promoting commerce in South America.....	\$25,000
District offices.....	50,000
Export industries.....	3,500
Directory of foreign buyers.....	30,000

CENSUS BUREAU

I have called attention to the fact before, I believe, that we are carrying \$19,000,000 in the bill for the Census Bureau as the first increment of a 3-year program for the taking of the Fifteenth Decennial Census. This census, as authorized in legislation that is pending, is to cost in the aggregate \$39,940,000. I might say right here that the last decennial census that was taken, as most of us know, was by far from being as accurate as it should have been, due in the main to lack of the proper amount of appropriations. The director of the bureau has assured this committee, however, that if the full amount of \$39,940,000 is appropriated over a 3-year period this census will be efficiently taken in every respect, and we have confidence in this statement.

BUREAU OF MINES

We have included in the bill for the Bureau of Mines a total of \$2,249,670, which is an increase of some \$148,000 for 1930. While some of this is absorbed by the Welch Act increases, nominal increases have been allowed in four or five of their funds.

HELIUM PLANTS

As the House no doubt is well aware, this committee started in on a 3-year helium program two years ago in conjunction

with legislation that was then passed for the conservation and processing of helium. The Fort Worth field was fast petering out and it became necessary to acquire other helium-yielding gas lands. This was done at what is known as the Cliffside structure, Texas, and negotiations have been under way and will be completed whereby the Government will obtain a vast acreage of gas land containing an enormous quantity of 1.75 helium-bearing gas. A plant has been built at Soncy, Tex., and on January 10, 1929, will start efficient operation. I am glad to say to the House that we have been reliably informed that this will settle the helium question for a long time in the future. It was estimated that the original 3-year program was to cost \$2,060,000. We have appropriated all but about \$500,000 of this, and, while this amount is not contained in this bill, contract authorization is included, and the bureau's representatives can go ahead and tie up the balance of this structure by contract and, when necessary, the money will be appropriated.

OTHER BUREAUS

With the exception of the Bureau of Fisheries, which we increased over the Budget estimates by \$8,000, the rest of the department's bureaus remain about the same as the current year with few exceptions, exclusive of the Welch Act increases.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

We have recommended for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1930 a total of \$10,724,430, an increase of \$5,000 over the Budget estimates submitted for the committee's consideration. Comparing the 1930 recommendations to the current appropriations there is a gross decrease for 1930 under 1929 of \$352,910. When there is taken into consideration, however, the total of \$1,316 which is contained in the current appropriations, covering the amount of \$208,000 for construction and repairs to immigration stations and \$1,108 for the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, no estimate for which has been submitted for 1930 and hence should not be considered as an amount to reflect a comparison between the two fiscal years, a net increase is shown for the department for 1930 over 1929. The total increases in the recommendations due to increases brought about by the Welch Salary Act and immigration inspectors' pay act, which I think I have already called the attention of the Membership of the House to, is \$767,800. Combining this amount with the gross reduction of \$352,910 and comparing the total with the amount of \$1,316,000 for appropriations for 1929 which do not recur for 1930, a net increase for the department of \$195,290 is shown.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask the gentleman a few questions, but perhaps I had better wait until he has finished his general statement.

Mr. SHREVE. No; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I am especially interested in the appropriation for the Immigration Service. I notice in the present bill there is an increase of \$805,000, but in looking up the report I find this is practically all taken up with increases in wages under the Welch Act and under other provisions, and there is only a small amount provided for added immigration inspectors. I am informed by the department that the committee has recommended an appropriation for about 75 additional inspectors.

Mr. SHREVE. I will state to the gentleman just what we have recommended.

The amount we have included for regulating immigration, including the border patrol, is \$7,915,000, an increase over the current year of \$805,000. Of this increase \$585,000 is due to salary promotions, leaving a balance of \$220,000 as a net increase for this purpose for 1930. This will be divided equally between the regular immigration and deportation work and the border patrol, making available \$6,046,560 for immigration and deportation work and \$1,868,440 for the border patrol.

This \$220,000 is about all they can absorb with their present machinery. There is only a certain amount of work that can be done.

Mr. SNELL. That is just the point I want to inquire about, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is very important. They inform me at the Department of Labor that all the new men provided for under this act will be assigned to two or three new bridges and to one or two new roads that are direct thoroughfares and will be opened up during the coming year, and there will be practically no new men to be provided for the northern border. The situation there is this: During the last few years, with the opening up of the direct roads to Montreal and Ottawa, there is a tremendous amount of travel. There came in through Rouses Point last year 325,000 and through Trout River nearly as many. We have practically no provision for looking after or inspecting this immigration. The man at Trout River called me up one day last summer and said he had been working for

18 hours a day until he was played out and that there were 500 cars there that day, and asked me what he should do about them. I told him that I had no authority over him, but that I would let them go through, and that is what they are doing.

Our country is being flooded with Chinese who are coming in across the border because there is no one there to look after the work, and our jails are being filled with them.

There is one thing we really ought to do, and that is provide enough ordinary inspectors there to look after the immigration that is coming across the northern border at the present time, or admit that we are paying no attention to enforcing the law in that section.

The increase carried in this bill really amounts to nothing. The department says with the increase allowed in the present bill this year they do not see how they can get any additional men. I think it is unfair to the service and to the people who use the service.

Mr. SHREVE. I am quite familiar with the situation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. If the gentleman will yield, over the telephone we have been informed that the amount appropriated is for 75 immigration inspectors, 35 clerks, and \$35,000 for administration expenses, making a net increase of \$240,000 over the appropriation for 1929, exclusive of the Welch Act.

Mr. SNELL. That is just as I understand it, and 75 inspectors will be taken up by the new bridge at Detroit and new bridge at Brownsville, Tex., and one or two new roads. There is no provision for additional men on the New York border, where there is a tremendous travel every day during the summer season.

Mr. SHREVE. It is a question of the allocation of the men.

Mr. SNELL. If they do not have them they can not put them on this border.

Mr. SHREVE. They do not have to put them all in these two places.

Mr. SNELL. They say that they have to man these two new bridges. They say that the new bridges and the new roads will take practically all of these inspectors that will be allowed under this appropriation bill. We do not see where we are to get any new men. We ought to appropriate enough so that they can take care of the situation, and it should be done now in this bill.

Mr. SHREVE. I would like to ask the chairman what he would suggest.

Mr. SNELL. We ought to have \$100,000 additional to take care of the border places, some on the southern and some on the northern boundary. The Labor Department asked for it.

Mr. SHREVE. No; the Labor Department gave us to understand that they are getting along pretty well as it is.

Mr. SNELL. They tell me that they asked for this. Of course, I take the word of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but we can not fool with this matter any longer—we are going to have more inspectors or we are going to let the people come through.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the gentleman from New York is correct in his statement that the Labor Department did ask for an amount that would have justified the employment of many more inspectors. Assistant Secretary White stated that over and above the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget an appropriation of approximately \$585,000 had been estimated for. Mr. White further explained that in making up that estimate he thought it was well they should have \$300,000 to meet emergencies, even though it might not be used. So I would say the difference between the amount allowed and the amount estimated for as actually needed was approximately \$300,000.

Mr. SNELL. That is just as I understand it. Here is a cement road leading to Montreal, and one man on there for 24 hours or 18 hours service, and 500 automobiles a day coming through. Now that is absolutely senseless. We either ought to put enough men on there or say, "Come along, boys, and go through." They understand that they can get through the northern border because it is not well guarded.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman says \$100,000, but would not he limit the amount to something less?

Mr. SNELL. We need not put them all there. I imagine that 15 or 20 extra men would be sufficient.

Mr. SHREVE. That would amount to about \$50,000. Would the gentleman be satisfied with \$50,000?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I do not want to be unreasonable, but I want the travel and the public accommodated.

Mr. SHREVE. I am very familiar with the situation.

Mr. SNELL. Well, that would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think it would be well if the committee took under consideration proper housing facilities for automobile passengers going back and forth from Canada.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ARENTZ. Take the matter of the customs port just above Seattle. They take the men, women, and children off these automobiles and put them on the sidewalk in the rain, with absolutely no place to go for shelter. It seems to me that this committee ought to consider the advisability of providing some quarters where the men and women and children could be examined by the customs officials instead of exposing them to the elements and compelling American citizens and others to open their luggage at the curbs.

Mr. SHREVE. That is very true, but the same argument might apply to many places. I myself have seen wagons draw up in front of these offices and men and women have to get out in the rain, and it is a shame, but we can not do these things all at once; it takes a little time. Improvements are being made all of the time. We have increased the appropriation more than a million dollars for the border control. We are getting along just as fast as possible.

Mr. ARENTZ. But you could pick out at the prominent points some building or residence that could be rented, next to the customhouse, and let that serve as a place where these people may be examined.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that might be so.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

We increased the United States Employment Service \$5,000 over the Budget estimate, bringing their total increase over the current year to about \$17,000, and making available for this service for 1930, \$217,000. In the application of the Welch Act the service lost about \$5,000, and the committee felt justified in restoring this amount.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman stated that some increase has been made for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, for increasing its agents abroad. Can the gentleman tell me how many new agents the increase contemplates?

Mr. SHREVE. I can not say. We have given them somewhere about \$280,000 increase this year.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I want to ask the gentleman something about the appropriations under the Labor Department for deportation. Information has come to me that during the past year men have been arrested and seized and are ready for deportation, but that because of lack of funds the department has had to release them and has not deported them.

Mr. SHREVE. That is the same old story. Last year we were told that there was just enough money to keep the men who have charge of that in operation for eight or nine months in the year. We very promptly gave them enough money to keep that organization working all of the time.

That means that they are deporting about a thousand a month, from twelve to fourteen thousand a year. That organization is not constructed as a unit so that it can carry on any greater amount of work. They are in fact doing all that they can with that organization now. If you want to go out and set up an entire new unit, it will take time to do it. I have heard no complaint about deportations during the last year since we gave them money to work the whole year round.

Mr. NEWTON. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if there are men arrested and seized and kept in custody, who are subject to deportation, and who then are released and not deported, because of lack of funds, that there is something wrong.

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely, but this is the first that I have heard of any such condition. Nothing came out in the hearings of that nature.

Mr. NEWTON. The department made no statement of anything of that kind to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. NEWTON. I thought that the gentleman would agree with me that if that was the case, it should be remedied.

Mr. SHREVE. We want to appropriate all of the money that is necessary to carry on this work and do it as satisfactorily as it can be done.

Mr. NEWTON. There ought to be some way so that if they get to running near the end of their funds, they can at least deport those whom they have spent the money on, and seized.

Mr. SHREVE. Congress will be in session soon again.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BOX. In connection with the question just propounded by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], I note with interest what the chairman of the subcommittee says, and I am not engaging in any criticism of the subcommittee. However, I think the facts are as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON]. I note what the gentleman in charge of the bill says to the effect that the appropriations are sufficient to take care of the present organization. My information is that the law as now existing would authorize an increase of this organization, and that this organization is not adequate; but that the funds provided by the committee are sufficient to take care of the present organization.

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct.

Mr. BOX. But do not authorize an increase. The chairman of the subcommittee will remember that some of us presented amendments trying to increase this appropriation a year ago, and the gentleman and his associates were successful in making the argument that he makes now. Does the information coming into the gentleman's committee from the Labor Department indicate that they have all of the men they need or that they have all of the funds that they need for the present force?

Mr. SHREVE. The latter statement is nearer correct; they have all of the funds necessary to take care of their present force. Of course, we realize that they could use more men, but there is not a department in Washington that could not use more men. We must equalize things. We are doing the best we can, but we hope that between now and a year from now we may make a further study of this situation so that when the new Congress comes in next fall we can approach this problem intelligently and constructively and carry out a program that will meet with the approval of everyone.

Mr. BOX. When the question was discussed on the presentation of this item in the appropriation bill before, it was suggested that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization ought to report legislation providing for any additional organization. That should be done. I have introduced and sought to have the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization report such legislation. The passage of such a bill would be a legislative mandate to the Labor Department to make the organization adequate, and to the Appropriations Committee to report the appropriations necessary to the maintenance and work of an organization which would better enforce the immigration and deportation laws. I would be gratified if the committee would report and the House would pass such a measure.

My studies have convinced me that the law now authorizes the increase of this force, and my opinion, gathered as carefully as I could gather it, indicates there are a great many cases of men who ought to be deported, who have to be deported, but are not deported because they have not the amount of money—that is, they have the money for the number of men they have, but not enough men to carry it on.

Mr. SHREVE. The chairman of the subcommittee will be pleased to go over the situation with the gentleman some time again and look up the laws.

Mr. STOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. I will.

Mr. STOBBS. I was quite interested in talking at times with members of the Department of Justice and the Department of State, and the question has come up whether or not they have opportunity of coming before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and saying what they needed, or whether they are allowed only to state what the Director of the Budget thought they should be allowed to have.

Mr. SHREVE. We go over it rather carefully with the information we have, and if the gentleman will look at page 13 of the Department of State hearings he will find it all set out, what the Budget allowed, and so forth, and what they think they can do it for; there is nothing concealed.

Mr. STOBBS. I do not say as far as the gentleman is concerned or the subcommittee that there is anything concealed. Take the Department of Justice with which I am more or less familiar. The question comes up, Do the Committee on Appropriations ask them what they feel they want or do they get what the Director of the Budget tells them he thinks they are entitled to?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say they are getting just exactly what the Committee on Appropriations think they ought to have, which may be higher or less than the Budget.

Mr. STOBBS. Do they talk perfectly frankly; do they ask for more than the Budget Director allows?

Mr. SHREVE. They talk very frankly. I think every man tells the exact truth, and the truth is what we are seeking.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Olds, the former Undersecretary of the State Department, before he severed connection with the State

Department, in a statement made before the Foreign Relations Committee, said that the State Department submitted itself to the Budget Director.

Mr. SHREVE. It is all in the book.

Mr. STOBBS. Whatever the Budget Director approves then, that is the only thing they ask for?

Mr. SHREVE. We will get all the information; it is easy to find out.

Mr. STOBBS. The gentleman says this informal talk before the gentleman's committee does not preclude an additional estimate because of the disapproval of the Budget Director. That does not amount to anything.

Mr. SHREVE. No; we simply want to get the facts, and they give them.

Mr. STOBBS. My point is, would the Budget Director approve or disapprove?

Mr. SHREVE. The Budget is the leveling institution pointing out how much money we can spend in the course of the year. We try to conform in reference to the money that is available for these definite propositions, and by so doing the country has saved millions of dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield right there? I do not understand the report of the Bureau of the Budget presented at the beginning of the session of Congress includes the estimates made by the departments. It only includes the estimates presented to Congress by the Budget, that is all.

Mr. SHREVE. I think that is correct, but the various departments have information which we try to obtain in order to come to a conclusion.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I quite understand; but the report does not include the estimates put up to the Bureau of the Budget by the various departments?

Mr. SHREVE. My recollection is it does not.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The committee handling these appropriations has all of that information, all of which is included except two matters in which the House may be interested. I have just called Mr. SNELL's attention to the fact in reference to immigration which you will find in reference to the State Department. You will find that was brought out also when the Secretary was before us. As we read these items in the bill under the 5-minute rule, if Members are interested, the members of the committee will be glad to give that information to Members inquiring.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand that. But the report of the Bureau of the Budget which comes in here in a large volume does not include the estimates made by the departments. I think, as a supporter of the Budget plan, it would be well to give to the House a full picture, including the estimates made by the departments.

Mr. SHREVE. Does the gentleman think that would throw very much light on the situation? Remembering the old way when bills used to come in largely padded up in the hope by those who prepared the estimates that they would, even after reduction, get what they really required, does the gentleman think that would be a good idea?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes. I do not think the departments do that now. I think they estimate now only according to their necessities. I think if we adopted the plan suggested we would avoid such controversies as we have had here in the last 24 hours by having a full showing of what was estimated by the particular departments whose items are being considered.

Mr. SHREVE. I can see no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I had promised the gentleman of New York [Mr. BLACK] some time, but he was not here at the moment. I waive that time, and with the permission of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would like to extend to him 10 minutes.

Mr. SHREVE. All right.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend as part of my remarks the true version of the song made familiar to the country in the last campaign, entitled "The Sidewalks of New York."

Mr. TILSON. May I inquire if it is a new publication?

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; it is the second national anthem, the first being the Star-Spangled Banner.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Commenting on the reapportionment bill a Kansas Democrat said that under the new apportionment bill Kansas would lose one Congressman, and that

Kansas was entitled to a greater reduction than that. After the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] made his remarks I thought I would look in a rather superficial fashion into the question of the alien population in the United States. I find that the States having the greatest alien population are mostly Republican States, so that the Democratic Southern States under the proposed amendment to the apportionment will gain representation, while other States will lose it.

Mr. BACON. That shows that the gentleman from Kansas is not playing politics.

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; neither am I. If the gentleman coming from Long Island, the port of entry of the bootleggers, the first district of New York, is reconciled to the speech of the gentleman from Kansas, I for one am not; because I am tired of hearing these attacks upon our State. The fellows from back in the woods make a practice of getting up and pointing at New York as representing everything that is terrible.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is the gentleman referring to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] as coming from the backwoods?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes; but he is coming out gradually. Having contact with New York City there is hope for him. [Laughter.]

New York is not asking Federal subsidies. It is not going around with its hat in its hand begging the Federal Government to put it on its feet. It is able to keep its own footing. New York aliens and New York citizen troops marched off to the war gallantly, and I believe they performed fully as well as the jayhawkers of Kansas. [Laughter.] Kansas, as you know, was a part of the Louisiana Purchase and New York helped pay for it, and I am not yet certain that it was an unprofitable investment. [Laughter.]

New York provides a much better type of citizenship in Alfred E. Smith than does Kansas in the person of the mud-slinging William Allen White. Let us have peace within the borders of the Nation. Let us stop these attacks on New York State. To my mind these attacks are founded on economic jealousy, and nothing else. Kansas and other States can stand a liberal sprinkling of aliens, and if they did they would come out of their medieval holes.

I want to warn the Members of this House that any time a drinking dry gets on this floor and makes an attack on New York it will not be healthy in my presence. They have either got to stop drinking or they have got to stop abusing New York. Indiana is always finding fault with New York's governor and all the while Indiana has two governors working for the State, one in the capital of the State and the other in jail. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to insert the Sidewalks of New York.

THE SIDEWALKS OF NEW YORK

Song and chorus by Charles B. Lawlor and James W. Blake

VERSE I

Down in front of Casey's old brown wooden stoop
On a summer's evening we formed a merry group;
Boys and girls together, we would sing and waltz,
While the "Ginnie" played the organ
On the sidewalks of New York.

VERSE II

That's where Johnny Casey and little Jimmy Crowe,
With Jakey Krause, the baker, who always had the dough,
Pretty Nellie Shannon, with a dude as light as cork,
First picked up the waltz step
On the sidewalks of New York.

VERSE III

Things have changed since those times; some are up in "G,"
Others they are on the hog, but they all feel just like me,
They would part with all they've got could they but once more walk
With their best girl and have a twirl
On the sidewalks of New York.

CHORUS

East side, west side, all around the town,
The tots sang "Ring a Rosie," "London Bridge Is Falling Down";
Boys and girls together, me and Mamie Rorke,
Tripped the light fantastic
On the sidewalks of New York.

Mr. BLACK of New York. My advice is to keep preachers out of politics. Run your own organization. Do not allow

your politics to be run by evangelists and people of that kind. We of New York, people of all nationalities, go on the basis of the golden rule, and through cooperation we have erected the most glorious city of the ages. We have proved that all of God's children can live happily together.

Now, with your permission, gentlemen, I would like to read a little poem which I wrote some 10 years ago. It is as follows:

NEW YORK

The living life, the life that leads the way,
All human heart and sharply vital soul,
A body tingling thru the night and day
A mind imperial, a will of world control;
A purse unclosed, a manner grandly gay,
A purpose dwarfing Tyre's or Athen's goal;
Her riches wavelike swell beyond survey,
Though earthling, near defying Heaven's toll.
Her past and present barely flecked with dress.
The grand ne'er stays the paitry as its mate;
The mean but glimmers briefly on the great.
Her future, New York prompts a world worth while,
Omnipotence, welding in a dazzling gloss,
Pray heaven and weary hell here reconcile.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS FUND

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the "Foreign Service building act, 1926" (U. S. C. p. 1953, sec. 295), and for each and every object thereof, including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings heretofore acquired under specific authorization of Congress for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee as to the status of the acquisition of foreign buildings by the United States embassies and legations abroad.

Mr. SHREVE. The building fund is going on. We are appropriating about \$2,000,000 every year now. The building commission is working with us and we have carried appropriations for everything they have recommended this year.

Mr. BRIGGS. About how many buildings have been acquired already?

Mr. SHREVE. I think there are about 30—that is, all over the world—but, of course, they are not being started. The gentleman will find it all set out in the hearings. I think there is a list of them in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to bring this point to the attention of the chairman. I have been wondering why it is there is no annual report made by the Secretary of State as by the other Cabinet officers. This bill indicates that he is charged, as we all know he is, with very important functions; we all know questions have been raised, some raised recently, with reference to the organization of the State Department and the need of some reorganization, and it is conceivable that an annual report by the Secretary of State might present to us facts that ought to be considered and recommendations that ought to have attention. I have frequently inquired for the annual report of the Secretary of State and I have been surprised to discover that he makes no such report. We can not find, therefore, in any one place the facts which probably we should have in order to legislate more intelligently. I think, for instance, there should be a report detailing all that is done with reference to carrying out the building program. I think there ought to be a report detailing what is being done in the way of promoting people in the Foreign Service, and so forth, and yet we have no annual report from him.

Mr. SHREVE. The reason of that, the gentleman understands, is because there is no authorization by law; that is, the statute does not require it. Further than that, many things which take place in the Department of State are of such a nature that they must be kept within the two countries that are effecting some settlement and you can not broadcast it, from the very nature of the thing.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman understands, as I understand, that there are many matters to which secrecy should attach and which should not be included in a report; nevertheless, I think that a report with respect to other matters might prove of very great value.

Mr. SHREVE. No doubt that is true, but it is within the discretion of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not think all of the other Cabinet officers are required by statute to make such report.

I made some little examination this morning and I am not certain there is such a specific requirement.

Mr. SHREVE. I think there is.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It would seem it is done as a matter of practice—as a matter of custom. However, I think it should be done by the head of the State Department, as well as by the heads of the other departments.

Mr. SHREVE. It is my understanding it is required of all the other Secretaries except the Secretary of State.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman be sure that there is a definite statutory requirement which compels the other Cabinet officials to file annual reports? I am not sure on that point.

Mr. SHREVE. That is my recollection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Without interrupting too much, the gentleman from Virginia apparently has availed himself of the privilege of using some of the time at my disposal.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I did not think the gentleman wanted all of his time.

Mr. BRIGGS. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether under the law it is contemplated that the United States Government is going to acquire consulates in practically all the places of importance that the United States has consuls, especially before it attempts to acquire buildings in the various national capitals. I notice that in one or two instances the acquisition of consulates has begun, and I was wondering whether that was contemplated to be done before the embassies and legations in the national capitals are undertaken.

Mr. SHREVE. No; I think there is no distinction drawn between the two. They are carrying on the work as seems to them most necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain in respect of Canada, signed February 24, 1925; for salaries and expenses, including the salary of the commissioner and salaries of the necessary engineers, clerks, and other employees for duty at the seat of government and in the field; cost of office equipment and supplies; necessary traveling expenses; commutation of subsistence to employees while on field duty not to exceed \$4 per day each; for payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear, not to exceed \$500; and for all other necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by the United States in maintaining an effective demarcation of the international boundary line between the United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada under the terms of the treaty aforesaid, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$29,525, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That when the commissioner, or the engineer to the commissioner, shall be absent from Washington or their regular place of residence on official business they shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence not to exceed \$8 per day each.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso in the paragraph just read. If the gentleman will refer to the paragraph he will find it reads:

Provided, That when the commissioner, or the engineer to the commissioner, shall be absent from Washington or their regular place of residence on official business they shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence not to exceed \$8 per day each.

Why should not this read the same as the provision for all other similar Government activities?—

Provided, That when the commissioner, or the engineer to the commissioner, shall be absent from Washington or their regular place of residence on official business they shall be allowed their traveling expenses in accordance with the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926.

The way the paragraph now reads introduces an exception to the general law which is not introduced as to any other activity, so far as I have seen in the bill, and the purpose of the enactment of the subsistence expense act of 1926 was to have uniformity, and the only way to have uniformity is to have it, and not make exceptions.

Mr. SHREVE. The law is very uniform, let me say to the gentleman, because there is only one man in this class.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. You have a commissioner and an engineer commissioner, both of whom you would except.

Mr. SHREVE. And he gets no compensation for the services rendered in the performance of this work and this is only adding an extra dollar to pay for his traveling expenses.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Is not the engineer a paid officer?

Mr. SHREVE. No; and this is only for one man, Colonel Jones.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If they serve without compensation I shall not press the point of order. If they were paid officers of the Government, I should certainly press the point of order.

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salary of the one member of the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1930, \$5,000;

For the cost of translating into and printing in the English language the publications of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, \$5,000;

For clerical assistance and traveling and office expenses, \$3,660;

Total, \$58,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman whether or not Congress receives any information from this commission as to its work?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes. The reports are made to the Department of Agriculture, but they go through the State Department, of course.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I find there are quite a number of commissions that do not seem to be required to make a report to any one.

Mr. SHREVE. That is true; but this one does make a report.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But there are commissions that do not make reports.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, it seems so, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And that is a case of bureaucracy uncontrolled.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

On yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] made a very interesting speech, but some of the statements in the speech, if left unexplained, would probably lead to misleading and erroneous conclusions. The gentleman stated that all the worth-while countries, particularly Great Britain, France, and Japan, are appropriating considerably more money for their departments of foreign and domestic commerce than our own country, and I know if that statement is left unexplained, as I have said, it will probably lead to some misleading conclusions. Has the gentleman explained that in the course of general debate?

Mr. SHREVE. I have already explained that; and let me state to the gentleman that they have only one fund for this purpose, while we have a very large number of such funds, and the appropriations when compared properly, are not very much in excess of those made by our Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. That is, the total amount of the appropriations made to the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce for this particular purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. We started this work with an appropriation of \$850,000 and we are now appropriating almost \$5,000,000 for this one bureau.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. And the appropriations that are made are adequate to cover the field?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, just what real benefit do we get out of this \$58,000 expenditure for the Institute of Agriculture at Rome?

Mr. SHREVE. It is for the constant dissemination of information about agriculture. I remember that a few years ago there was a total failure of the lemon crop in Sicily. This information was communicated by way of the Paris office and was here within 24 hours. It was broadcast to the Western States where they grow lemons and made a great difference in the marketing of the lemon crop that year. They are very quick in furnishing such information. I only mention this as one character of information, but information affecting all branches of agriculture is passed through the Paris office to Washington and then on to the various localities.

Mr. WINGO. Take the case which the gentleman has just cited, that information would have been broadcast even if we had not had this institute in existence?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. WINGO. A failure of the lemon crop of Italy would not have been broadcast?

Mr. SHREVE. In time, the information would get here, of course, but it was not a conspicuous matter of news. Let me read to the gentleman this statement about the work:

The American farmer is afforded information concerning the production, distribution, and marketing of all agricultural staples with reliable and imperial data in connection with the factors which determine the

formation of the prices of these staples in the world's markets. In this way this institute acts as a world clearing house for information on economic, scientific, and technical problems as they affect the agricultural industry of the world. By adherence to this institute the proper persons are able to obtain the statistical and economic information regarding farming, plant, and animal products, with the prevailing prices throughout the world. They are informed of the wages paid for farm work throughout the world. They also learn the nature of diseases which affect crops and plants throughout the world, are shown the territories affected, and are thus able to take measures for the prevention of the spread of these diseases. American adherence enables the interested agricultural units to learn of any new projects for the development of agriculture in any one country in the world. Besides being important to the farmer, American adherence benefits those interested in vegetable fat products, seed oils, coffee production, rubber growing, tea and tobacco production, fertilizing tests, cotton growing, etc.

This states a few of the things that the Institute of Agriculture at Rome was established for, and it is a work that they have been carrying on for many years.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. We should also bear in mind that this institute is of American origin. Mr. David Lubin was the originator of the idea. The idea was rejected in this country, but the King of Italy interested himself in it, and that is how this organization happens to operate from Rome. I have visited the institution, and for us not to participate in it would break off certain international associations and relations that we now have that I think are profitable to us, far and beyond any mere statistics we may get from this source. It is an international institution that all the countries of Europe, as well as other countries of the world, participate in; and I think it would be very bad form for us not to share in the work and also share the expense of the work.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with the organization, I will say to my friend from Iowa [Mr. COLE]. I knew Mr. Lubin quite well. I heard him many years ago before our committee, and I submit in all fairness there is nothing that has been stated in response to my inquiry which would show any practical benefit that the American farmer has gotten.

It is quite interesting to note the time when we get these statistics. I presume the gentleman has not thought of that. There is not a single fact that has been disseminated that is of practical benefit to the American farmer that would not have been disseminated by another agency in existence.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I think in connection with the new farm legislation they will be very much interested in production—as to what crops are profitable.

Mr. WINGO. I will say that the little bunch of pink-tea officials seated in a drawing room can furnish no information or advice, even to the Republican Party, which will be of benefit to it in solving the farm problem. I will say to my friend that I listened to the same argument in relation to rural credits. We brought Mr. Lubin over the seas before our committee, and we might as well have had the statement from a Hottentot in South Africa, as far as the benefit it was to myself or the committee of the House in solving that problem.

Statistical data is furnished by other governmental agencies. The crop data is furnished by news and commercial agents already in existence. I venture the assertion that 99 per cent of the statistics they disseminate they get from other agencies and facts already made public, and all on earth they do is to compile them.

There are a few rare things; but what are they worth? Not a thing to the wheat growers of the West, or the cotton growers of the South. I am not going to object to it, because we seem bound by treaty.

I mention this to accentuate the fact that I am not going to agree to any new expenditures of this kind, however beautiful it may be in theory. What we need in American agriculture is a method of orderly marketing of the surplus products. We have furnished ample credit agencies. During the 16 years I have been on the Banking and Currency Committee we have given them every kind of credit agency they asked. The only practical proposition unsolved is the marketing of surplus products of the United States. How this group of elegant gentlemen stationed in Rome can give any information of benefit to me or the gentleman from Iowa I do not see. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows more about the American farmer than these gentlemen in Rome ever knew.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. They are supposed to know as much as the good American farmer, and are supposed to furnish us with statistics as to surplus products in all parts of the world.

Mr. WINGO. We get those from the consular agencies and the commercial agencies and the news agencies. There is not a single news agency in the world that if there is an extraordinary event that effects the estimated volume of cotton in the United States that that will furnish it quicker than it can be furnished from Rome. You may have some calamity that will destroy the cotton crop in Kenya and the news will get to the world quicker than the Prince of Wales got to the coast, and the news agencies of the United States would get it quicker than the agency in Rome.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. This agency in Rome collects the data and tabulates it.

Mr. WINGO. What is the tabulation worth after you have received it and considered it?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. This is an official tabulation.

Mr. WINGO. The Department of Agriculture gets the tabulation first. The estimates of world cotton production by the Department of Agriculture we get a long time before the institute at Rome sends it out. As a matter of fact, the institute at Rome bases its statistics on world production of cotton largely upon the statements given out by the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. I shall not object, but if you want real economy start cutting off these things that take \$50,000 here and \$50,000 there and simply furnish salaries for people who are serving the farmer in name only.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to pay to the Government of Panama the eighteenth annual payment, due on February 26, 1930, from the Government of the United States to the Government of Panama under article 14 of the treaty of November 18, 1903, \$250,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information. The past two items that I endeavored to get information on were on page 19. What actual connection have we with the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration? I mean officially.

Mr. SHREVE. That is a treaty obligation.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, we entered into a treaty to help support something.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Officially what have we to do with it. They elect a member from the United States sometimes, do they not?

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman is referring to the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. SHREVE. Our appropriation is to meet the share of the United States for the expenses for the calendar year 1928, which amounts to \$2,000. That is the same amount that was appropriated some years past.

Mr. WINGO. That is not the World Court?

Mr. SHREVE. No. This item is authorized by an international treaty for the specific settlement of international disputes, signed at The Hague on October 18, 1907. This bureau is a record office for the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

Mr. WINGO. And the gentleman is getting that information out of the hearings?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. This does not affect this so-called Kellogg treaty, if it is ratified? It does not do away with the necessity for that?

Mr. SHREVE. I think not. This is simply an office where the records are kept.

Mr. WINGO. Certainly, at The Hague.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. If they can not settle a dispute, then the League of Nations will try, and if they can not, then perhaps the Pan American Conference will try, and then if they can not, who next takes it up?

Mr. SHREVE. I suppose this court here.

Mr. WINGO. Do you provide here for the expenses of this Pan American Conference?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. WINGO. Let us take the next bureau, the Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration. That seems to be a duplication in work. We propose to spend \$6,000 for that. What connection do we have officially with that?

Mr. SHREVE. This is to take care of our expenses for this Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration. This was another thing that was authorized on May 6, 1910.

Mr. WINGO. And my friend is reading from the hearings. Do the hearings disclose whether they ever made a report to us?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not prepared to state. This deals with all matters of international law which are concerned with the maintenance of peace, and its principal object is to bring before the various national parliaments questions concerning the amelioration of international relations.

Mr. WINGO. This is different from The Hague Tribunal which was in the preceding paragraph?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman recall a single instance where this Bureau of Interparliamentary Union settled any one thing, any one specific case, like the one in South America that the Pan American Conference prevented a conflict on lately? Can the gentleman give such an instance where this Bureau of Interparliamentary Union ever promoted world peace by taking care of any specific case?

Mr. SHREVE. I would refer the gentleman to Senator BURTON. I am not informed on that subject.

Mr. WINGO. I am not complaining about the gentleman's lack of information. Mine is just as great. I am not asking these questions in an argumentative spirit, but I hesitated to make the point of order. I suspect that some time, in a moment when we wanted to make another gesture for peace, we entered into an international agreement by which Uncle Sam would dig up his hard coin to support some of these tea hounds over there in some kind of an organization that would give them some prestige in diplomatic society. It is a wonder to me that we ever settle any disputes with all of these different, conflicting organizations, each with a high-sounding name, and each purporting to do the same thing. The gentleman is one of the best-informed members of the great Committee on Appropriations, and he can not recall a single instance where anything has been done in a specific way, and I venture to assert that there is not another man on the floor of the House who can do it, and I doubt that even Senator BURTON could recall an instance like that to which I refer. But the American taxpayer is patient. He believes in these gestures for peace. Every time he makes one he just digs up a little more coin and permits somebody else to sneer at him and insist that we did not have anything to do with the World War except to make money out of it—and then ask us for another loan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

For the share of the United States in the expense of conducting the International Bureau of the Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, at Berne, Switzerland, \$1,700.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN]. On page 21, lines 6 and 8, under the heading "Pan American Sanitary Bureau," I see we are called upon to contribute annually \$28,597.92 to help support this Sanitary Bureau. What particular sanitation does this group do? Can the gentleman state that without referring to the hearings?

Mr. ACKERMAN. No; I can not, but I can refer to the books. [Reading:]

The Sanitary Bureau, through correspondence, through its collection, publication, and distribution of data with regard to contagious diseases, of laws and regulations for their control, of methods of combating diseases, and in other ways fosters the spirit of cooperation in the Americas and stimulates health authorities to greater and more effective effort. Also the bureau stimulates the carrying out of ideas which are developed in the sanitary conventions and announces the existence of any plague-affected area to the adherent members so that they may take precautionary measures to isolate and quarantine those areas. The International Sanitary Bureau is distinct from the International Office of Public Health in that it is composed solely of American republics and is directly connected with the work of the Pan American Union in fostering more clearly relations between North and South American countries and in aiding those countries in the adoption of sanitary measures which in turn benefits United States trade and decreases the risk of infections and diseases being brought into this country. The International Sanitary Bureau aids in enforcing sanitary regulations in sea-ports hitherto shunned by merchant-marine vessels because of the danger of life attending the landing of goods or merchandise and the loading of vessels with return cargo.

Payment is made by the special disbursing officer of the department assigned to the Pan American Union by check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States. The expenses of the bureau are apportioned among the various members on the basis of population and the quotas received are used to defray the cost of clerical assistance, translations,

preparation of reports, and transactions in Spanish and English. The Pan American Union has charge of the disbursement of the whole fund.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has read a statement from the Assistant Secretary of State, as I recall. Of course, we have to pay this bill, because we are bound by an international agreement which the Senate ratified, but this bureau does not do a single thing along the line or purpose expressed in the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State that is not either done or could be done by the Public Health Service of the United States acting through the State Department dealing with the other Pan American States. But, of course, we can not defeat one more junket. Why Webster once in a burst of eloquence, in referring to the stretch of the domain of the British Empire, said that the sun never sets upon it, and talked about the morning air being filled with one continuous strain of martial airs of England. The sun never sets on international junkets, the expenses of which the Congress of the United States takes from the taxpayers of the United States. On them the sun never sets. There is one on the high seas all the time. I want to move to strike out, in line 22, page 25, the last section read, so as to get some information, as I see my time has about expired. Here is another one of international bureaus, page 25. This is the International Bureau of the Union for the Protection of Industrial Property. This is a meeting at Berne, Switzerland, and calls for an expenditure of \$1,700; evidently the amount of industrial property that needs protection is very small, as the amount asked for is very little. Evidently, there is only one man who indulges in going over there, and I doubt even if there is one, but I expect it is taken up in office expenses at Berne, Switzerland.

I do not know of anything that they are doing that could not be done here in Washington that is actually done over in Switzerland. But we are bound to this by one of our international treaties. It is an extraordinary week when the Senate of the United States does not bind the taxpayers of the United States to some additional expenditure by reason of some treaty whereby the taxpayer will be deprived by expenditure either upon land or upon the high seas by a junket or some gentleman's office position and salary in some foreign land to do something that any consul in a consular office can do. But that might interfere with some of their other activities, so the American taxpayer, at a time when we are facing a deficit of some thirty-odd million dollars, will have to pay for these extraordinary international "excesses" or whatever you might call them, who are the beneficiaries.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. A great many of these activities, or perhaps a majority of them, are carried on under statute, as I understand. Attention has been called to the fact that there seems to be a lack of necessity for some of them and more or less duplication. Would not the gentleman be able to get results, since he has undertaken the leadership in criticism of the existing condition, by offering a resolution and having it referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to bring about some investigation to ascertain what statutes should be modified or repealed? The Committee on Appropriations has no alternative except to provide for executing the statutes. It strikes me that there really ought to be a look-over of the commissions and bureaus which the gentleman is talking about, so as to eliminate those that can be profitably dispensed with.

Mr. WINGO. I hope the gentleman will not understand me as criticizing the committee. The committee is not at fault. The gentleman says most of these matters are founded upon a statute. The moral obligation is upon the committee, as it is upon the Congress, to go ahead and meet the pledged obligations of the United States.

I had a purpose—not an idle purpose—in directing attention to these things, because I hope that somebody having greater influence than I will do what the gentleman from Virginia has suggested. It might be well to have an inventory made of these activities and to take stock and see if we can not impose upon our diplomatic officers or representatives abroad these duties, so that these burdens will be saved upon our taxpayers.

Take, for instance, the Interparliamentary Union. I think there has been some consternation in the State Department over the action of an American member of the Interparliamentary Union who is dissatisfied with the handling of international affairs by our State Department, and who has openly announced in the newspapers that he has cabled to the officials of another nation, "Just wait until we get together in the Interparliamentary Union and we will supersede these admirals and diplomats." He seems not to be content to abide by the action of

the President, the State Department, and the Senate, but says, "Just wait until we get there and we will do away with all this red tape." Of course, the gentleman fails to recognize that we have not given him a commission to represent the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For the expenses of determining the amounts of claims against Germany by the Mixed Claims Commission established under the agreement concluded between the United States and Germany on August 10, 1922, and subsequent agreement between those Governments, for the determination of the amount to be paid by Germany in satisfaction of the financial obligations of Germany under the treaty concluded between the Governments of the United States and Germany on August 25, 1921, for the expenses of determining the amounts of claims against Austria and Hungary by the Tripartite Claims Commission established under the agreement concluded between the United States and Austria and Hungary on November 26, 1924, for the determination of the amount to be paid by Austria and Hungary in satisfaction of the financial obligations of Austria and Hungary under the treaties concluded between the Governments of the United States and Austria on August 24, 1921, and between the Governments of the United States and Hungary on August 29, 1921, and/or the treaties of St. Germain-en-Laye and Trianon, respectively, including the expenses which under the terms of such agreement of August 10, 1922, and the agreement of November 26, 1924, are chargeable in part to the United States; and the expenses of an agency of the United States to perform all necessary services in connection with the preparation of claims and the presentation thereof before said mixed and tripartite commissions, including salaries of an agent and necessary counsel and other assistants and employees, rent in the District of Columbia, employment of special counsel, translators, and other technical experts, by contract, without regard to the provisions of any statute relative to employment, and for contract stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. p. 1309, sec. 5), law books and books of reference, contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the President may deem proper, \$132,927.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the chairman what is the status of the extension, which I think the Congress requested here in a recent act, of the time for filing claims before the Mixed Claims Commission? I understood that is to be taken up with the Government of Germany. I was wondering whether an agreement had been reached.

Mr. SHREVE. The agreement has not yet been reached. It is expected it will be reached within the year.

Mr. BRIGGS. The reason I am asking is that there are several claimants in my district who were apparently barred by not knowing that they could present claims. Those negotiations between the United States and Germany have continued for some time.

Mr. SHREVE. We are expecting a report at any time now.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it probable that the extension will be granted? Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. We were so assured.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL AND SPECIAL CLAIMS COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For the expenses of the settlement and adjustment of claims by the citizens of each country against the other under a convention concluded September 8, 1923, and of citizens of the United States against Mexico under a convention concluded September 10, 1923, between the United States and Mexico, including the expenses which, under the terms of the two conventions, are chargeable in part to the United States, the expenses of the two commissions, and the expenses of an agency of the United States, to perform all necessary services in connection with the preparation of the claims and the presenting thereof before the said commissions, as well as defending the United States in cases presented under the general convention by Mexico, including salaries of an agent and necessary counsel and other assistants, and employees and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, law books and books of reference, printing and binding, contingent expenses, contract stenographic reporting services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. p. 1309, sec. 5), the employment of special counsel, translators, and other technical experts, by contract, without regard to the provisions of any statute relative

to employment, traveling expenses, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the President may deem proper, \$350,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would also like to ask, in connection with this Mexican Claims Commission, whether that commission is functioning or likely to function in the near future? I understand that for some time past the commission has been marking time, awaiting the appointment of a commissioner by the Republic of Mexico, and that no assurances have been received, unless very recently, that there was in contemplation the appointment of one of these officials, so that the commission could function.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that the commission is now functioning to the extent that it is getting these cases ready. The third commissioner is not yet appointed.

Mr. BRIGGS. If the commission has not yet been completed, how can it proceed with its work?

Mr. SHREVE. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is contained in the following extract from the hearings, which I will read:

The examination and development or attempted development of 1,950 special claims from November 1, 1927, to November 15, 1928.

Up to date, the General Claims Commission has disposed of 76 American claims, in which the amount claimed was \$4,366,208.66.

The awards rendered are in the sum of \$2,301,573.09, which does not include a sum by way of interest, running with those awards in which interest was granted of, in the amount of \$400,690.65.

Nine Mexican claims have been heard by the commission. The amount claimed was \$320,455, and the amount awarded was \$39,000.

There have been no further claims heard by the Special Claims Commission. That, of course, was bound to be so because there was no presiding commissioner. All the time which was taken up in Mexico City at the recent meeting was devoted to hearing the 25 claims before the General Claims Commission.

Mr. BRIGGS. What is the total number of claims filed up to date?

Mr. SHREVE. Nineteen thousand five hundred.

Mr. BRIGGS. And what is the aggregate amount?

Mr. SHREVE. Something over \$4,000,000. I can not give the gentleman the exact figures, and the figures are not here because they were not certain.

Mr. BRIGGS. My recollection is that the number that have been adjudicated is comparatively small.

Mr. SHREVE. It is small.

Mr. BRIGGS. Compared with the vast amount involved in the claims that have been filed?

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct. Nine Mexican claims have been heard by the commission. The amount claimed was \$320,455 and the amount awarded \$39,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Have any of these claims been paid?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. BRIGGS. And there is no indication as to when they will be paid?

Mr. SHREVE. On page 166 of the hearings it appears:

An agreement as to the appointment of a new presiding commissioner involved the appointment of a commissioner for both the general and special commissions, so that now both the General and Special Claims Commissions have a presiding officer, Dr. K. Sindballe, of Denmark.

That information was just handed to me by the Clerk.

Mr. BRIGGS. And the commission will begin to function again and adjudicate claims?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of clerks of United States circuit courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, travel expenses pursuant to the subsistence expense act of 1926 (U. S. C., pp. 1888, 1889, secs. 821-833), and other expenses of conducting their respective offices, \$1,943,400.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Has the committee any information on the question of the so-called duplication of legal activities in the various departments of the executive branch of the Government? I noticed not long ago that the attention of the House was called to the fact that there was a great deal of duplication with reference to the legal work and that there ought to be some consolidation of that work. Did the committee go into any matter of that kind?

Mr. SHREVE. The effort naturally is to have the Department of Justice finally pass on all these matters, but each and every department has its own attorneys and has its own legal advisers; but it is expected that everything should clear through the Department of Justice. I do not know of any overlapping and I have not heard of any.

Mr. BRIGGS. I noticed that a question arose with respect to the oil leases between the Department of the Interior and the Attorney General's department. We had two sets of counsel advising the Government there, and finally the Attorney General's opinion was sought; and, of course, prevailed. That opinion required the cancellation of the leases that had already been entered into, and we might have avoided much that was involved there if the advice of the Attorney General had been obtained in the first place. Then I have noticed there is a growing tendency to impose upon the Government a large expense for special counsel, or alleged specially qualified practitioners, to represent different bureaus and different commissions of the Government. I have wondered why the Department of Justice could not fulfill those requirements and officiate rather than to require the Government to turn so much to the employment of special counsel.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, the department finds it is necessary sometimes to employ special counsel, men particularly qualified to carry out a certain line of investigation. Of course, the gentleman must remember that salaries in the Department of Justice are low and that many of the young men over there are just beginners and possibly have not had the ripe experience that older lawyers have had, so that the experienced branch of the service finds itself overwhelmed with work and it is necessary sometimes to go out and get special counsel.

Mr. BRIGGS. I appreciate there are instances where special counsel are required; but it occurred to me that perhaps by some expansion of the Department of Justice, along the lines intimated by the gentleman, whereby it can be thoroughly equipped with a capable and competent staff, the Government would be able to obviate a very large part of the expense that it is now necessary to meet by the employment of special counsel for different agencies of the Government, separate and apart from the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, that is a matter that is worth considering, I will say to the gentleman.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Probation system, United States courts: For salaries and actual expenses of probation officers, as provided by section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925 (U. S. C. p. 516, sec. 726), \$25,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. Was a suggestion made of a larger appropriation for this service?

Mr. SHREVE. Not by the department; no. There has been quite a difference of opinion about this appropriation. We have taken the pains to write the judges and we find that some judges are not in favor of the system while many others are. The law is going to require some changes before it is going to be universally satisfactory to the judges.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was prompted to ask the question because I have had a good deal of information, as doubtless other Members have, from judges who approve this system but say the present appropriations are insufficient.

Mr. SHREVE. They did not use all the money that was appropriated last year. The trouble with it is, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, that these men are under civil service, and the judge does not want to pick out a member of his official family from a list of three names sent to him, and this will have to be changed before the system is a complete success.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Air-navigation facilities: For the establishment and maintenance of aids to air navigation, including the equipment of additional air mail routes for day and night flying; the construction of necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; repairs, alterations, and all expenses of maintenance and operation; investigation, research, and experimentation to develop and improve aids to air navigation; for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere (not to exceed \$82,540); purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, including their exchange; maintenance, operation, and repair of airplanes, including accessories and spare parts and special clothing, wearing apparel, and suitable equipment for aviation purposes; and for the acquisition of

the necessary sites by lease or grant, \$5,458,620: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any purpose not authorized by the air commerce act of 1926.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In the report I notice this department has been cut down in its appropriation something like \$34,000. Is this in any way curtailing the activities of the Aircraft Bureau?

Mr. SHREVE. No; not at all. It may curtail somewhat their local force, but it does not affect their general operation.

Mr. HUDSON. It seems to me the work of this bureau is so important that they should be granted the largest amount possible.

Mr. SHREVE. We have been very liberal with them, and this will not affect their field work at all.

Mr. HUDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. In the matter of granting Federal licenses for pilots, are there any fees returned to the department or the Treasury? Is any fee charged in the granting of these Federal licenses?

Mr. SHREVE. There is a small fee charged and, of course, as all other moneys so collected, it is turned into the Treasury.

Mr. HUDSON. If there is a fee charged, of course, it probably goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. SHREVE. Of course, it has not been going on long enough for us to tell what it will amount to in the future.

Mr. HUDSON. I wondered if any particular revenue was produced from this source.

Mr. SHREVE. Not yet; no.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

District and cooperative office service: For all expenses necessary to operate and maintain district and cooperative offices, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs, purchase of maps, books of reference, and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, not exceeding \$1,200 for newspapers, both foreign and domestic, for which payment may be made in advance, and all other publications necessary for the promotion of the commercial interests of the United States, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, \$620,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce may require as a condition for the opening of a new office or the continuation of an existing office that commercial organizations in the district affected provide suitable quarters without cost to the Government or at rentals at lower than prevailing rates. The Secretary may, at his discretion, refuse to open a new office or continue an existing office where such assistance from local commercial organizations is not provided;

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if the amount provided in this bill is regarded by the department as sufficient to enable it to carry on all the essential activities of the bureau in an efficient way?

Mr. SHREVE. Of course, the amount is not sufficient to carry on all the activities, possibly, they would like to carry on, but it is sufficient to carry on the activities which should be conducted this year.

Mr. BRIGGS. All the essential ones?

Mr. SHREVE. We made a general increase affecting this department following our usual policy. We have tried to treat everybody alike. Of course, the other bureaus have to have appropriations, but we have given this bureau about what is usual.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand it the committee has increased somewhat the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce over and above the Budget estimate?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; about \$88,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. In order that the bureau may have an opportunity to function properly?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand it, the committee is thoroughly in sympathy with the splendid work which this organization is doing to promote trade not only in the domestic field, but in the foreign field.

Mr. SHREVE. That is true, as shown by the increased appropriations we have given them every year.

Mr. BRIGGS. And it may be said that this agency of the Government is probably contributing as much in its service for the upbuilding of the prosperity of the country as any other agency of the Government service?

Mr. SHREVE. I think the gentleman is quite right about that.

Mr. BRIGGS. To bring to the attention of the people generally some concrete idea of what excellent work this bureau is doing under the leadership of its capable and highly efficient director, Hon. Julius Klein, I take this opportunity of including herein a portion of some remarks made by me lately before the Committee on Appropriations for adequate appropriations for this valuable service:

I know that you gentlemen have had stated to you the general value of this service to the American people, and you have shown a rather liberal and broad spirit in endeavoring to give to this service the consideration that it deserves. The value of the returns for this service is emphasized in the records of the department, which show, for instance, that the trade opportunities developed by this department increased from 571,766 in 1926-27 to 708,964 in 1927-28, or an increase of 24 per cent in the trade opportunities for the industrial interests of the United States during that period of time.

The number of visitors who came to the department for information rose from 73,781 in 1926-27 to 103,694 in 1927-28, an increase of 40 per cent. That shows the growing interest in the service and it shows that they are providing the people with a splendid service. Further, their records show that the number of letters handled in 1926-27 was 177,307, while in 1927-28 the number rose to 241,099, an increase of 36 per cent. Over the same period, or from 1926-27 to 1927-28, the number of telephone calls increased from 71,006 to 95,009, or an increase of 33 per cent. The overtime for employees in these offices, or in the district office service, is now 16.8 days per year, that being the average overtime per man employed. Another thing, of course, which has always been the real test, is what are the people getting out of this service in dollars and cents? These 29 district offices are now serving 21,696 firms. The value of the service rendered is emphasized by this statement, that 851 firms reported in 1925-26 to the Department of Commerce that they received on account of this service results amounting to \$7,319,323, or an average of \$8,608 per firm.

In the period 1926-27 there seemed to be a decline in the number of firms using the service, or at least reporting to the department. The number decreased to 405, but the total results showed business obtained of the value of \$9,718,330, or an average per firm of \$23,995. That shows an increase of about \$2,500,000 for that year. Then in the period 1927-28, 819 firms reported total results of \$14,506,913, or an average of \$17,712 per firm, or nearly \$5,000,000 more in business than was reported for the year before. You can see from that the progression that obtains in this service and the constantly increasing service that is performed for the people. If the average benefit per firm of \$17,712 were applied to the 21,696 firms served by the bureau during 1927-28, the total results would be \$384,279,552. The total for 1927-28, \$14,506,913, is thirty-three times the amount spent by the Government in furnishing the services that resulted in this business, the appropriation for that year being only \$435,000.

Of course, nobody knows out of all these firms using the service but not reporting just how much they are making if they do not report. Many of them do not report the figures, and the increase disclosed here is shown by those who do report.

Briefly, I would like to call your attention to the way our export trade has been developed. In 1914 the total export trade of the United States amounted, in round figures, to \$2,434,000,000, and in 1927 our export trade amounted to, in round numbers, \$5,056,000,000, an increase of 107 per cent. Since 1922, when the total was a little over \$3,000,000,000, there has been a steady increase. The United States exports to Latin America have increased from 1910-1914 average of \$340,000,000 to \$845,000,000 in 1927, an increase of 180 per cent. In 1914 the United States furnished 24 per cent of the total Latin-American imports, and was second to Great Britain. In 1927 the United States furnished 37 per cent of the imports, followed by the United Kingdom with 16 per cent. That shows you how our trade has increased with Latin-American countries, and it has been done largely through this service.

Now, in all those years there has been created an increasing demand for this service, and there must necessarily be some need for expansion. I want to indicate to you right here something that transpired the other day. It so happened that representatives of the southwestern flour mills, including those engaged in Kansas City, southern Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma, and Colorado, came to me with reference to some flour extension service they wanted dealt with by the Department of Agriculture, which was already handling it. They wanted some increase in the service, and they said to me, "Congressman, we want to report to you that as a result of efforts made last year, with the aid of the Department of Commerce, there was established a port service to the east coast of Brazil from the port of Galveston, and as a result we are intrenching ourselves in Brazil as great flour dealers." They said, "We export now down there probably more flour than any other country, perhaps even including Argentina."

They said that a large part of the Argentine flour is being blended with American flour, and some of it is now being brought into this country. They are developing this business, and they are developing it

very largely with the assistance of the service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, both at home in the district offices and at the offices in Brazil.

The export-trade representative for the southwestern millers further said: "The other day I was in Denver talking to one of the large wholesale grocers there, and he said to me, 'Since the Brazilian service from Galveston has been started by the Shipping Board we are able to import our coffee with a saving of from 65 cents to 67 cents per 100 pounds.' They claim that could be saved to their trade all through the West. They are using the trade service of the Department of Commerce. I want to call attention to the fact that the department has recently stationed at the port of Galveston Mr. Long as district manager. He had been the trade commissioner in Brazil and is a man of experience and capacity. He possesses a high order of ability and is well qualified to serve this particular trade. I know that you gentlemen are interested in the development of trade, and feel sure that is one reason why Mr. Hoover is making his good-will trip to South and Central America. It is to promote good feeling between those countries and our own and also to establish greater trade with them. All of us were for the new South and Central American air mail services on that account. That may be expensive to begin with, but they will result in large returns to the United States.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It is my understanding that in 1921 each service of the Department of Commerce cost the taxpayer \$2.65. At the present time it is costing the taxpayer only \$1.35 for each service, and these services are very important.

I should like to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] for the really very great work that he and the members of his committee have done in making possible through the appropriations that they have given to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce the great development of the commerce of the United States. You and your committee a number of years ago had the vision to see the great need of this country finding a market for its products to take up the slack between supply and demand.

President Coolidge and Mr. Hoover, the Secretary of Commerce, have been heartily in accord with your plan, and the work of directing the expenditure of your appropriations has been most efficiently carried on by Dr. Julius Klein, the able Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce.

In 1921 the bureau had 700 requests a day for services. At the present time the bureau is averaging 11,000 requests per day. In other words, the work has increased sixteen times since 1921.

Last year the bureau received 30 per cent more than it received the year before.

In 1921 the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was \$900,000. This last year it was approximately \$4,300,000.

In 1921 each service rendered by the bureau cost the taxpayer \$2.65. At the present time it costs the taxpayer only \$1.34 for each service. These services are much improved as the actual information has become more accurate since 1921. In 1921 the reports of trade conditions abroad, and so forth, were more or less guesswork, as at that time they did not have the highly trained specialists, such as trade commissioners and experts, to gather specialized information.

At this time everything points to a value of over \$5,000,000,000 in our export trade for the current year. Last year the exports for the whole year amounted to \$4,865,375,000. This year for the first 10 months our exports have been \$4,113,592,000.

The increase in our export trade has benefited the small shippers and companies as well as the big shippers and companies. The services rendered have been of particular benefit to the small manufacturers and merchants, as they can not possibly afford to send some one to foreign countries to secure information that is furnished almost immediately by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SHREVE. There has been great improvement during the last year, let me say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and we hope to keep up this improvement right along.

Mrs. ROGERS. And it is the intention of the gentleman to increase the appropriations, I understand?

Mr. SHREVE. Every year we hope to give them a little more money.

Mrs. ROGERS. And with the lowered cost we are getting very much better service, and it seems to me very constructive, effective, Coolidge economy and shows Hoover business ability.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am overjoyed that this committee has increased the appropriations for our trade development at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SATURDAY, December 8, 1928.

TRADE COMMISSIONERS, BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE
Statement of Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have appeared before your committee every year asking for appropriations to develop our foreign and domestic trade, and you have given those appropriations.

I know that in my own State of Massachusetts there is very great satisfaction over the results achieved by the Department of Commerce in developing sales abroad and at home of various commodities made in Massachusetts.

Speaking first of the domestic part of it, we have a branch office, as you probably know, in Boston. They are very much overworked there. They need at the present time a liaison officer between the Boston office and the manufacturers all over New England.

The more directly, as I understand it, the work can be accomplished in actual sales, by information as to what foreign countries wish to buy and as to what we make and where we make the various commodities in this country, the better the results achieved.

JAPAN

I am going to tell you a story about what Japan is doing in the line of trade commissioners, because I think it is quite significant. I asked your committee for a trade commissioner to go to Singapore, and you granted that request. The trade commissioner was making a survey of the various industries in this country before going, talking with various selling agents, taking samples of materials made in our mills to Singapore, and just two or three weeks before he was to sail he discovered that Japan had found out that we were sending a trade commissioner there and that Japan's trade commissioner had already arrived in Singapore. Japan is doing much to expand her foreign trade.

Japan, principally because of long hours and low cost of labor and the encouragement given to the industry by the Government in pursuance of its policy to stimulate the industrialization of Japan, has been able to increase her production and distribution of cotton textiles in a very substantial manner.

It is not necessary to go into the details of production or even to submit figures as a growth of the industry can be clearly demonstrated by pointing to the increase in her exports of cotton piece goods. These export figures are not readily available on the yardage basis for certain comparative years but even considering the increased value of cloth exported, the fact is that in 1903 her exports of cotton piece goods came to nearly 7,000,000 yen in value; in 1913, 43,000,000 yen; in 1923, 234,000,000 yen; and since 1923 have been running at a value of between 250,000,000 and 350,000,000 yen a year. (Value of a yen, about 50 cents.)

One comparison in yardage exports will be sufficient. In 1923 her exports amounted to about 748,000,000 yards, while in the calendar year 1928, based upon the figures for the seven or eight months now available, they are running at the rate of about 1,500,000,000 yards for the year.

This large increase in Japanese cotton piece goods exports has been attributable not alone to the fact that Japan produced under conditions of long hours and low labor costs, but also to the fact that the Government has extended many aids and encouragements. Some of these aids take the form of shipping subsidies, credit facilities, and the like which enable the Japanese to lay down large quantities of piece goods in consuming markets at prices which have made heavy inroads into the business formerly held by Great Britain, the United States, and other countries. So far as such competition with the United States is concerned it has been most keenly felt in Africa, the Near East, Persian Gulf, and Red Sea territories and to a considerable extent in India, China, and other far eastern territories on staple piece goods which the United States used to supply in quantities.

There is another reason I want to give for the necessity and advisability of having a liaison man. A good many of the manufacturers, I find, at first are a little bit afraid of having the Government have any connection with their business, and sometimes you have to explain the matter to them. They must be shown that the Department of Commerce is an aid to business; that it so operates and does not dictate or interfere.

I am very much interested in the development of trade in South America and I am perfectly delighted that Mr. Hoover has gone there. I remember in 1914, during the war, the various diplomatic representatives here used to say to my husband and me over and over, "Why don't you develop your trade with South America? We would like to

trade with you, but you do not make it easy for us. You do not tell us what you have in a way that makes it easy for us to deal with you. You have not yet learned that we know what we want to buy. You tell us what you want to sell and what we must buy."

TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR ARGENTINA

I am very anxious to have a textile and boot and shoe trade commissioner go to Argentina. They tell me there is a big market for our textiles there and the manufacturers tell me that they feel there is a very big market in Central and South America and in other countries for the sale not only of our goods by yards—that is, yardage—but garments actually made up, such as pajamas, underwear, dresses, etc.

Practically all of the countries of South and Central America have been growing markets for American cotton textiles. Argentina is our largest market in South America and perhaps offers the best possibilities for further development.

In 1926, the last year for which figures are available, there were imported into Argentina a total of 28,388 metric tons of cotton piece goods from all countries. Of this, the United States shipped 2,530 tons, or almost 9 per cent of the total. (Argentina import figures are not available on a yardage basis.)

That our own exports to Argentina are steadily increasing is evidenced by the fact that in 1913 we exported to that country 1,529,000 yards, valued at \$180,000, while in 1927 we exported nearly 25,000,000 yards, valued at \$4,345,000.

In shipments of cotton yarn to Argentina the increase has been even more pronounced, for, while in 1922 we exported to Argentina 15,500,000 pounds of various kinds of cotton yarns, their takings from us amounted to about 28,000,000 pounds in 1927.

Our textile business in Argentina is diversified and complicated. A great many American firms do business there and it is done in various ways ranging from having one's own sales office or salaried representative to the appointment of local agents on a commission basis. Customers range from the retail merchant to the wholesaler and manufacturer. Even some mail-order and house-to-house business is undertaken on American goods.

Because of the diversity of American textile products being sold in Argentina and the many methods of distribution it would be very desirable to have a textile trade commissioner on the spot to aid American manufacturers and merchants in extending their business. He could engage in all kinds of cooperative effort short of actually executing the orders.

Argentina is interesting to American manufacturers and merchants not alone as a market for cotton piece goods and yarns but as a growing customer for such textile articles as certain items of knit goods, garters and arm bands, corsets and brassières, waterproofed outer garments, silk dresses, collars and cuffs, etc.

The business to Argentina in certain classes of hosiery, underwear, and outerwear has fallen off with American manufacturers due to the fact that local production is increasing under the higher tariff rates assessed against imports. However, American merchandise of the sort is liked, and it is possible to maintain some branches of this business in spite of handicaps if proper aid and encouragement is given to American manufacturers and merchants.

Indeed, exports from the United States to all countries of some items such as knit goods garments, haberdashery, corsetry, etc., are increasing substantially, and it is desirable to encourage this development for in so doing we export not alone the textile fabric incorporated in the article but the further developed product of American skilled labor.

TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR CARIBBEAN SEA AREA

Then in the Caribbean Sea area, I am very anxious to have a boot and shoe and textile trade commissioner. They also tell me that there is opportunity in India.

India is a very interesting and important buying and selling market for American textile interests from several points of view:

1. As a large producer of raw cotton entering into competition with American cotton.
2. As a manufacturer of cotton piece goods, some of which enter the world's markets in competition with American cotton piece goods.
3. As a producer of jute and burlap, enormous quantities of which are used in the United States and regarded here by many as competing as a substitute with American cotton piece goods.
4. As a large importer of cotton piece goods.

Every one of these subjects is of vital interest to various branches of the American textile industry and an American trade commissioner specially trained and qualified to analyze the situation and supply American interests with essential information would be very valuable.

Perhaps his most important work would be in developing the market for American cotton piece goods although he would give considerable attention to developing markets for various items of clothing such as underwear and hosiery, shirts and other haberdashery, the sale of which in India has increased modestly.

To get a picture of the importance of India as a market for cotton piece goods let us look into the years 1914, 1923, and 1928. These are the fiscal years ending March 31.

[Quantities in millions of yards]

Fiscal year ended Mar. 31	Indian imports of cotton piece goods, including tents			
	From all countries	From United Kingdom	From Japan	From United States
1914	3,197	3,104	9	10
1923	1,593	1,453	108	8
1928	1,973	1,543	323	25

From this it will be seen that the total imports of cotton piece goods from all countries has diminished considerably. This is due principally to the increased domestic production of cotton piece goods.

Great Britain's shipments to India in the 18-year interval have declined to approximately one-half of the more than 3,000,000,000 yards shipped in 1914.

The exports of cotton piece goods from the United States to India have increased slowly but steadily since 1914, being now at the rate of about 25,000,000 square yards a year or two and one-half times the amount shipped in 1914.

It is Japan, however, which has made the most remarkable strides, for her exports to India increased from a bare 1,000,000 yards in 1912 and 9,000,000 yards in 1914 to over 323,000,000 yards in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928.

Of the 25,000,000 yards shipped to India from the United States in the Indian fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, a large proportion were remnants. Indeed there was a time several years back when, with the exception of a few lines of staple branded gray goods about all we could sell to India were remnants. Now, however, the situation is considerably changed and there is a general falling off in our shipments to India of so-called staple gray goods and we are increasing shipments of regular lines of colored and fancy goods to that market.

India is a long way off, is favorably disposed to American merchandise, and it is believed that our textile shipments to that country could be increased steadily if some one or more specialists were located on the spot to aid American interests.

You all know that during the war we overexpanded, and we have got to have something to take up the slack between the supply and the demand.

My own textile industries have suffered very much. Some of them at the present time, fortunately, are doing very well, and they are doing well because they know how to sell the articles that they make and they have learned to make what the people want.

The only thing that we can do to keep ahead of other countries in the kind of things we make and in their quality is to be constantly and ably represented abroad, have people who will study conditions there, who will tell us what they are making in foreign markets, what the cost of production is, and how they sell. They must tell us what other countries will buy.

At the present time we have one of our trade commissioners studying production in England; studying, so far as possible, costs; studying how their market goes; finding out exactly what they make.

MACHINERY SURVEY

I am very anxious to have a further appropriation for a machinery survey. You let us have a small appropriation last year for that. I understand that at the present time they are utilizing that for a survey of knitting machines for the manufacture of sweaters. The sweater manufacturers are delighted to have that done and feel that a great deal can be accomplished.

The machine-tool people are very much interested in this survey and I have had a great many letters about it. The following letter has been received from the publishers of the American Machinist:

AMERICAN MACHINIST,

New York, N. Y., December 4, 1928.

Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Word has just reached me that you are to appear before the Appropriations Committee to-morrow on behalf of the proposed survey to determine the percentage of obsolete industrial equipment in use. I want to take this opportunity to express the sincere hope that you will be successful in convincing the members of the Appropriations Committee that such a survey is well worth while. At the same time I want to indorse all that was said by Mr. L. C. Morrow, at that time managing editor of the American Machinist, when the previous hearings on this appropriation were held.

You know, of course, and I presume that the members of the Appropriations Committee know also, that such a survey was conducted in the machine-tool using industries by the American Machinist three years ago. The results of that survey showed that 44 per cent of the equipment in use in those industries was more than 10 years old. In other words, that it was obsolete.

The survey attracted considerable attention at the time and the mission it endeavored to accomplish was backed up by further editorial

efforts on the part of the American Machinist's staff and by the makers of that type of equipment through their advertising pages.

Many of the machine-tool builders with whom I have talked in recent months attribute the unusual activity in their business to the fact that the metal-working industries in general are taking drastic steps to replace their obsolete production equipment. In spite of the fact that very few new plants or plant extensions are in progress, sales of machine tools are now being made at a higher rate than at any time since the war, and a few of the more progressive companies are doing more business now than they did at any time during the war.

It is at least reasonable to believe that somewhat similar results would follow a survey of obsolete equipment in other industries, and I earnestly hope that you will be able to secure the funds necessary to conduct such a survey.

With best regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

K. H. CONDIT, Editor.

AIRPLANE INDUSTRY IN SOUTH AMERICA

If I may have a minute or two more, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak a little about the work that is being done in South America with reference to the sale of our airplanes there, and if I may extend my remarks in your hearings, I have quite a number of statements showing what has been accomplished in the development of our trade along that line.

Mr. SHREVE. We shall be very pleased to have you extend your remarks by inserting in the hearings those statements in which you think the committee will be interested.

Mrs. ROGERS. A year ago, just about this time, I discovered that I had forgotten there was an embargo on airplanes into Mexico, and I took the matter up with the State Department, and the embargo was lifted. I had a great many letters from airplane manufacturers expressing their pleasure, and I became very much interested in the future of the airplane industry in Central and South America.

I have had a great deal of communication with different airplane manufacturing plants, talked with people that came up from South America, and found out what was being done down there.

The Department of Commerce has been doing very constructive work in South America, and as a result they have sold a good many planes of our manufacture there.

Aeronautic developments in Latin America have come rapidly during recent months. It is significant and important that more than 10,500 miles of air services are in regular operation in the southern Republics. There are approximately 100 aircraft in use on those air lines, and approximately one-half of the machines were made in the United States.

It was recalled that European aeronautic missions visited South and Central America and the West Indies repeatedly following the war. This prolonged activity resulted in the introduction of aircraft from Europe, and in the general belief that this equipment was superior to any other. The peoples in the area decided to cooperate with Europeans in providing air services within Latin-American territory and between South America and Europe. A French company extended its France-to-Africa service across the Atlantic (using steamers) and along the east coast of South America. German interests have succeeded, in varying degrees, with air services in Colombia, Brazil, and Bolivia.

With a view to increasing the sale of American aeronautic products abroad, the Department of Commerce sent a well-prepared aeronautics trade commissioner to South and Central America in August, 1927. A similarly equipped assistant aeronautics trade commissioner followed in August, 1928. These and other representatives of the Departments of Commerce and State have been able to interest American manufacturers in the southern markets and assist them in introducing their equipment there. Satisfaction was expressed in regard to the recent sale of 36 planes by an American company to Chile. It was stated, too, that American passenger and mail planes were shipped recently to Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Argentina, and Cuba.

According to figures of the transportation division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the total value of aeronautic products exported from the United States to Latin-American countries during the first nine months of 1928 was \$723,280, or nearly as much as that for the year 1927. Twenty-four aircraft, worth half a million dollars, were exported to these markets in 1927, and 55, valued at \$558,577, followed up to October 1, 1928. The total value of our aeronautic exports in 1927 was \$1,903,560. This figure for the first nine months of 1928 is \$2,931,721. A large part of the increase was in larger exports to Canada.

Reference was made to the progress of the Pan American Airways (Inc.), who have extended their Habana-to-Key West daily service to Miami and announced that two flights each way will be made daily, beginning shortly. The same company has a three-times-a-week seaplane service, recently inaugurated, between Miami and Nassau, and they will start one between Habana and San Juan, P. R., in January. According to reports, the company will soon open a daily service between Habana and Panama via Central American capitals and Merida, Mexico. An associated company in Peru has been operating a highly successful and thoroughly reliable service between Lima and seaports along the north coast of Peru. They plan to extend their services to Chile, to

Panama, and across the north coast of South America to San Juan. I am of the belief that our aeronautic manufacturers and operating companies who have become interested in southern countries have made a thoroughly worth-while effort with highly satisfactory results and that they may be expected to compete successfully with European interests. The necessity for businesslike and fair practices and the sale of superior equipment is recognized as of the utmost importance.

I am told that England very shortly is sending a fleet of planes there and other countries are increasing their trade activities. One reason I became so vitally interested is because I realized the protection that is needed in Central America, for instance. The Panama Canal must be protected.

Very few people in this country seem to realize how far ahead of us other countries have gone in air commerce in Latin America. It is humiliating that the pioneer aeronautical move in Latin America was started by the Curtiss Co. in 1914; but since then, foreign countries have left us so far behind that until recently we have not been real competitors. I have been told that the advantage of this rapid system of communication between the commercial centers of western Europe and the east coast of South America can not be overemphasized. Ever since 1914 people from those countries have said, "Why does not America develop her trade in our country?" The development of the air mail service is undoubtedly a necessary part of our preparedness program. The transmission of orders, remittances, quotations, specifications, and other business correspondence will give our European competitors a tremendous advantage in this trade arrangement. The factor of interest savings and the multiplication of activities of capital employed in this trade alone will place our exporters at a handicap compared with European firms.

PANAMA CANAL

One of the vital factors of our defense system is, of course, the Panama Canal and its complement of railways and military defenses. Without these the coordination of our Atlantic and Pacific Fleets will be well-nigh impossible, and closely related with this phase are our lines of communication and intelligence in the Caribbean area and the east and west coasts of South America.

This, in turn, is bound to be closely related in the future with military, naval, and commercial air services in these areas. Unfriendly aviation units of any of the above three classifications dominating these areas will react unfavorably on the above-mentioned communications and intelligence service in a time of actual or threatened hostilities. One of the presumptions of our national-defense system is that an attack against us could be only launched by a strong naval power. Unquestionably sound strategy would be an attempt by such a power to cut off our trade and communication with the American countries to the south of the United States. Unfriendly air forces of the above three classifications would be an invaluable aid in any such tactical plan, particularly in the case of a European power.

These things being apparent, it is advisable to consider the present aeronautical situation in the Latin-American countries to-day and this situation is, to say the least, highly unfavorable to the United States. To begin with, there are elements of foreign (European) personnel connected with the Mexican air services in various responsible positions. Secondly, commercial aviation in Colombia is dominated by a German-Colombian air transportation company, and Colombia's military aviation is in charge of a Swiss instructor. Passing down the east coast of South America we next come to Venezuela, where military aviation is administered by French instructors, as is also the case in Brazil, where an exceptionally strict control is exercised by a French military mission. Argentina maintains a permanent military mission of its own in Europe, which is very responsive to European influence and can not in any way be regarded as susceptible to American. A British naval mission acts as advisor to the Chilean naval and aviation operations, and high officers of German birth and former German rank and citizenship dominate the Peruvian army. The same situation exists in Bolivia as in Peru, and protests against both these missions were made by countries signatory to the Versailles Treaty without effect as the provisions against German military missions contained in this treaty were defeated in this instance by transfers of citizenship.

The relatively small aeronautical activities of Ecuador are regulated by Italian instructors. It can thus be seen that European influence predominated almost entirely in military aviation affairs in South America and this influence is strengthened by the presence of the operations of the French Compagnie Aeropostale with air-mail lines in Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina, and the German air interests such as the Kondor Syndicat, operating in Brazil, the Aero Lloyd Boliviano operating in Bolivia, and the "Scadta" in Colombia. Other concessions for air lines in South America are now being sought by European interests and these, if secured, will still further weaken our influence in aeronautical affairs in South America.

The above summary shows very clearly the need for action upon the part of this country at an early date and it is believed that this action should take the form, at least, of the establishment of air mail and commercial lines to Central and South America.

Mr. OLIVER. Germany, I assume, is making sales of planes.

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; and France is making sales. They also have a line on the west coast in South America. While we were the first country to go into South America with the airplane, other countries up to the present time have exceeded what we have accomplished. I am getting figures from the Department of Commerce on that point, if I may put those in the record.

EXPENDITURES BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR TRADE PROMOTION

America's expenditures on her foreign trade promotion are not as large as those of our principal trade rivals. On a per capita basis, our Canadian neighbors will spend nearly twice as much as we will during the present fiscal year. If the appropriations of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were on the same basis as those of the Canadian Commercial Intelligence Service, the United States would spend \$8,196,888 instead of \$4,257,357.

On the basis of current appropriations and 1927 export figures, American expenditures on trade promotion are only 76 per cent of those of the British Department of Overseas Trade. In other words, it would require an increase of \$1,310,000—from \$4,257,357 to \$5,567,357—to make the appropriations of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce equivalent to those of its British rival.

Even Japan is spending more proportionately than the United States. Considered on the same basis as Great Britain, it would be necessary to increase the bureau's appropriations by \$763,000—from \$4,257,357 to \$5,020,357—to make them equivalent to the Japanese expenditures.

Germany has no separate funds that can be definitely identified as comparable to the appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, but from all we know of her great efforts to regain her lost trade we have every confidence that the American expenditures taken on a comparable basis are considerably less than those of Germany, possibly by as much as 25 per cent.

These figures do not tell the entire story by any manner of means. Take Great Britain, as an example. The British Government has undertaken to spend approximately \$48,500,000—or at the rate of \$4,850,000 a year for 10 years—on the promotion of the sale of Empire products within the Empire. Although this is primarily a domestic sales campaign, it has a direct bearing on American trade, not only in the British Isles but also throughout the British Dominions and Colonies, which, taken as a unit, constitute our most important single market. In fact, 42 per cent of our total foreign commerce is with the Empire.

Again, the British Government will spend in their fiscal year 1928-29 the sum of \$437,500 on the Export Credits Guarantee Department, an increase of \$185,000 over the 1927-28 appropriation. Since 1920 a revolving fund of \$126,000,000 has been set up to take care of the commitments guaranteed under this single piece of legislation which is directly concerned with British trade expansion.

Another example of British promotion activities that may be cited in the British Empire Exposition, held at Wembley in 1924 and 1925. In 1924 the British Government spent \$875,000, while five sections of the Empire, to mention only a part of the participating countries, contributed about \$3,000,000. These figures represent, it may be assumed, only a small part of the total expenditures and are exclusive of an operating deficit of \$7,500,000. This undertaking and its succeeding follow-up efforts are but part of a large trade-promotive program.

Another type of indirect trade promotion on behalf of British trade is found in the East African loan act, under which a revolving credit of \$48,600,000 has been created for the development of transportation facilities, such as railroads, roads, and harbors in British East Africa. A large part of these credits will, it is expected, be utilized in the development of commerce in British machinery and equipment.

The growing importance of promotion activities in international trade is further emphasized by other examples. France is proposing to spend in 1929 over 25,000,000 francs on certain phases of her export drive. This does not tell the whole story, as this represents only part of the official expenditures. Due to the interlocking relations between the French trade promotion bureau and French chambers of commerce, there are other expenditures which are not in the official budget.

Italy will spend in her fiscal year 1928-29 nearly seven and a half million lire for some of her trade activities. This does not include semiofficial items, such as are represented by the recent floating fair of Italian products which toured Latin America, displaying the best Italy could supply in many lines, the total value of the exhibits alone being 5,000,000 lire.

Australia furnishes another interesting example. In London and Paris this enterprising Dominion is spending, according to the 1927 Australian Yearbook, about \$125,000 a year at each post for trade promotion. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce will spend \$99,750 in the United Kingdom and \$90,025 in France. Even the Union of South Africa is in some respects spending more money than the United States. For instance, at Milan, Italy, where both countries have offices, South Africa has a budget of \$55,000, as compared with an American expenditure of \$7,310.

Our New England council, I know, is extremely pleased with what has been accomplished by your committee and by the Department of Commerce. I do not hear any criticism. I hear nothing but praise about what is being done. This trade promotion not only affects one

part of the country but it affects the entire country. Of course, I can not help feeling the greatest interest in my own section of the country.

We have certain geographical handicaps and we have certain handicaps in our hours of labor and wages, so that it makes selling pretty difficult sometimes for our Massachusetts industries.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

For salaries and necessary expenses for preparing for taking, compiling, and publishing the Fifteenth Census of the United States and for carrying on during the decennial census period all other work authorized and directed by law (U. S. C. pp. 329-338, secs. 1-112), at a total cost of not to exceed \$39,490,000, including rent of office quarters in and outside the District of Columbia; salaries of employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including temporary employees in the District of Columbia who may be appointed by the Director of the Census, under civil-service rules, for any period not extending beyond June 30, 1932, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Director of the Census, without regard to the classification act; *Provided*, That such temporary employees in the District of Columbia may be allowed leave of absence with pay at the rate of two and one-half days per month; the employment by contract of personal services for the preparation of monographs on census subjects; per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of the same and of detailed employees, whether employed in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; *Provided further*, That employees of the bureau may be paid in lieu of all transportation expenses not to exceed 7 cents per mile for the use of their own automobiles or not to exceed 3 cents per mile for the use of their own motor cycles when used for necessary travel on official business; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce; the purchase of supplies and equipment, including books of reference, periodicals, maps, manuscripts, punch cards and materials, and other contingent expenses; the maintenance, operation, and repair of a passenger-carrying automobile to be used on official business; the purchase, rental, repair, and exchange of typewriters, calculating machines, punching, tabulating, and sorting machines, and other office appliances; the construction of punching, tabulating, and sorting machines, including technical, mechanical, and other services in connection therewith, whether in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and printing and binding at the Government Printing Office, \$19,000,000, to continue available until June 30, 1932, of which sum \$100,000 may be immediately available: *Provided further*, That existing law shall not operate to prevent the use of such portion of this appropriation as may be necessary for the purchase of supplies, printing and binding, and other contingent expenses: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, in his discretion, to suspend during the decennial census period such work of the Bureau of the Census, other than the Fifteenth Census, as he may deem advisable.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on page 63, lines 6 and 7, to this language:

at rates of pay to be fixed by the Director of the Census, without regard to the classification act.

The paragraph under consideration authorizes the expenditure of \$39,000,000. What is the reason for providing that the Director of the Census fix the rates of pay without regard to the classification act?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say that this paragraph is undoubtedly subject to a point of order, but if it is made it will cost the Government \$5,000,000 more to do it under the classification act than if the language is left in the bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am glad to have that explanation. I read the hearings on that item and there did not appear to be any explanation why it was done. Of course, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania can give us the assurance that that language will work economy in this expenditure, I shall certainly take his assurance and withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SHREVE. We are assured by the different bureau heads that that is the fact.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it the understanding of the committee that \$39,490,000 is necessary to take the census?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the 10-year census—the authorization will be for \$39,700,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This is the census we are going to take?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; it takes two or three years' preparation for it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And it costs this immense sum to obtain it.

Mr. SHREVE. It does.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For the payment of fees to witnesses; for traveling and other expenses when on official business of the Supervising Inspector General, Deputy Supervising Inspector General, supervising inspectors, traveling inspectors, local and assistant inspectors, and clerks; for instruments, furniture, stationery, street-car fares not to exceed \$25, janitor service, and every other thing necessary to carry into effect the provisions of title 46, chapter 14, page 1488, United States Code, \$153,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the committee give us any information with reference to whether or not it entered upon any investigation as to whether or not there are enough inspectors in the Steamboat Inspection Service to enable it to work efficiently? It seems that there was a great deal of criticism at the time of the *Vestris* disaster as to alleged insufficiency in the number of inspectors; and I have heard it urged again and again that there is not a sufficient number to enable this service to discharge its duties efficiently.

Mr. SHREVE. The head of the bureau has not completed the investigation and he was not prepared to say that they did not have enough inspectors. The matter needs further investigation, and later on he will have the information so that we will be in a position to pass upon it intelligently.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is fair to say that they contemplate some legislation on this subject.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understood that there had been a request by the inspection service for additional inspectors, and I wanted to know whether the committee had dealt with the matter by granting additional ones.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman must have been misinformed; there was no application for an increase in the number of inspectors. I think the gentleman from Alabama will corroborate me.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My recollection is that it was stated that the plans to which the gentleman has referred might be so worked out that they could ask for additional legislation in this Congress, and probably they might require additional inspectors.

Mr. BRIGGS. The conclusion reached, then, was that additional legislation would be required before they had additional inspectors?

Mr. SHREVE. There must be an authorization of law.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Utilization of waste products from the land: For the survey of the possibilities of the industrial utilization of waste products from the land, including cooperation with colleges, other institutions, and manufacturers, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$52,700.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think it was three years ago that the first appropriation for this purpose was made, if I remember correctly.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. This small expenditure of \$50,000 three years ago, two years ago, and what is now continued here, has already resulted in great good. We have one or two institutions that are based on the developments made through this small appropriation enabling the Bureau of Standards to cooperate with various institutions, especially the college at Ames, Iowa. Newspaper publishers have informed me that these developments, especially the making of print paper from the pulp of cornstalks, is already beginning to affect newsprint paper prices, and that they are able to make lower contracts. They attribute it to the beneficial results of this investigation. I believe the time is coming when we will have many factories utilizing these raw materials, and I think the beginning was made when this first appropriation was made by this subcommittee three years ago.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the gentleman. The committee will be glad to have that information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public works: For constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels for the Lighthouse Service as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce not to exceed \$1,155,000; and for establishing and improving aids to navigation and other works as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce, \$485,000; in all \$1,640,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is there any provision in this item for any new lighthouse vessels?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. If so, whether there is any special designation of where they will be located?

Mr. SHREVE. We never designate in the bill where they shall be located. There are items in the bill covering both lighthouses and lighthouse vessels.

Mr. BRIGGS. How many new light ships are provided for? I do not mean tenders.

Mr. SHREVE. The authorization, I think, was made a couple of years ago, and we are just carrying it out now. It strikes me there are three.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it the committee's purpose to carry on that appropriation until the authorization has been carried through?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. So that the Lighthouse Bureau will be equipped with a sufficient number of vessels to meet the existing demand?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the intention; yes. I can tell the gentleman now just where these vessels are to be located. There will be a lightship at Brenton Reef, No. 39, which is in the third district, and a lightship, at Hen and Chickens, No. 42, second district, a relief lightship, No. 3, third district, and there will be a new tender to replace the tender *Pansy* in the third district. It takes two or three years from the time the appropriation is made before we can get these vessels into service.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is the purpose of the committee to go forward with this authorization in subsequent bills to satisfy the needs of the bureau?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the present plan of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of \$30,000 for the fiscal year 1928 for a fish-cultural station as an auxiliary to the station at Leadville, Colo., is continued available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1930.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NEWTON: Page 88, after line 6, insert:

"For construction, repair, alteration, and improvements to buildings and walls at the fish-cultural station at La Crosse, Wis., \$10,000."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture and filing cases, \$60,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information from the committee about this Patent Office item. May I ask if anything has been done in the Patent Office about arranging some method of taking care of the patent papers in that building? I have had occasion to go there several times on patent matters, and I have found that priceless information in the way of original records are left there and in case of fire we would lose them all. There are no duplicates. I have had occasion several times also to ask the men in charge if steel cabinets or safes of any kind are provided to take care of that material. They could not be duplicated in case of loss, and the thing is very serious.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, we realize that situation, and that is one of the reasons for the Archives Building. Eventually all of these things will be taken care of in fireproof buildings. We are going at the matter as fast as we can. We did enable the Patent Office to get some steel filing cabinets, and we tried in that way to help them.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Have those patent records been taken off the floors and off the top of these wooden structures?

Mr. SHREVE. Many of them. A number of them were taken off last year. We gave them \$65,000 for that one item.

Mr. O'CONNELL. We ought to do something about it, because the matter is very serious. Those things could not be duplicated in case of fire.

Mr. SHREVE. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Regulating immigration: For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including not to exceed \$178,160 for personal services in the District of Columbia, together with persons authorized by law to be detailed for duty at Washington, D. C.; traveling expenses; main-

tenance expenses of insane alien deportees detained abroad while en route to the country of destination; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States" (U. S. C. pp. 133-143, secs. 138-178), and acts amendatory thereof and in addition thereto; necessary supplies, including exchange of type-writing machines, alterations and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of aliens into the United States by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax, maintenance bills, and immigration fines upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$7,915,000: *Provided*, That \$1,868,440 of this amount shall be available only for coast and land-border patrol: *Provided further*, That the purchase, exchange, use, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles and allowances for horses, including motor vehicles and horses owned by immigration officers when used on official business required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than \$150,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles, and of such sum of \$150,000 not more than \$125,000 shall be available for the purchase and maintenance of motor vehicles for coast and land-border patrol.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not my purpose to raise any issue with the Committee on Appropriations concerning this appropriation. I do, however, want the House to understand the fact as I believe it to be. First, I will say the organization for the enforcement of the immigration and deportation laws is not adequate. It has been presented to the House time after time. Members of the Committee on Appropriations have urged that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization ought to report some further legislation dealing with the subject. I believe the reporting of such legislation would constitute a congressional mandate which would authorize and require the department to extend the organization, and that they would gladly do it. The appropriation of such additional funds ought to be made. I will not undertake to say to the House just what is needed. It is an important and rather serious undertaking. I certainly would have to have further advice as to specific details and directions before undertaking to specify the exact amount required. The amount needed is large. This work is suffering. I regret that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has not reported the legislation mentioned. I hope that it can and will be done soon, and that when the matter comes up again it will have the sympathetic consideration of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like it very much if something could be done now, even if the measure of relief granted is small.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the needs for an increased appropriation were also called attention to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], and I recognize that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] entertains the same views. The committee have felt that we should have more inspectors, but, in view of the pendency of legislation which we think may greatly aid the department in carrying out this work in an economical way, we hesitated about increasing the amount of the appropriation. However, there are some emergency needs, as the gentleman from New York has pointed out, and as the gentleman from Texas states. After consultation with the chairman I have offered an amendment to increase this appropriation by \$50,000, and I will ask the chairman if it meets with his approval?

Mr. SHREVE. I am very much pleased to join with the gentleman from Alabama in authorizing this money, because I am quite familiar with the situation described by Mr. SNELL to-day, and I know they need the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: Page 110, line 14, strike out the figures "\$7,915,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$7,965,000"; and, in line 15, strike out the figures "\$1,868,440" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,918,440."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a single question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. Under the item, "Bureau of Immigration," the increase in appropriation for salaries alone is very material, the percentage of increase over last year being very large. I am wondering what is the reason for this?

Mr. SHREVE. I am very glad the gentleman mentioned that, because it is all occasioned by the Welch Act; not quite all.

Mr. TILSON. From what we learn from the papers nobody had an increase under the Welch Act. At any rate, everybody seems dissatisfied with the bill. Who gets this increased sum?

Mr. O'CONNELL. All the employees of the department receiving more than \$7,500.

Mr. TILSON. Those employees certainly do not get the amount appropriated here. There are only a few of these employees—

Mr. SNELL. Five hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. TILSON. It is a tremendous increase for salaries alone. Is it all due to the Welch bill?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will be interested to know that the committee made an appropriation which they felt would be used to increase the pay of some of the border patrol and some of the inspectors. However, before it was effective the Welch bill was passed, and the department took the money with which it was expected to increase pay and used it in the employment of additional inspectors. The Welch bill carried the increase of salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Labor, of officers, clerks, and employees appointed for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, as provided in the acts authorizing a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and establishing the Bureau of Naturalization, approved June 29, 1906, and March 4, 1913, and subsequent acts (U. S. C., pp. 157-166, secs. 351-416), including not to exceed \$74,420 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of which amount \$10,000 shall be available only for compensation of temporary employees; traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$400 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the naturalization of aliens when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; street-car fare, telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in offices outside of the District of Columbia; necessary supplies and equipment for the Naturalization Service; not to exceed \$25,000 for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia where suitable quarters can not be obtained in public buildings; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpoenaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation shall be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, \$790,030: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the compensation of assistants to clerks of United States courts.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BOX. I do this, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for the purpose of calling attention to the facts stated here in the discussion this afternoon in connection with naturalization and the laws within the respective States giving the right of suffrage to unnaturalized aliens. My information is that very few of the States confer that right under their present statutes. Formerly a great many States did not allow any declarant alien the privilege of voting. Among those were my own State, Texas, and several others, which I do not recall at this moment, but Texas has during recent years ended that practice and now requires that the foreign born be naturalized in order to vote. My information is that every State which formerly permitted declarants to vote has amended its laws in that respect, so that none of them now allows declarants the right of suffrage. If there are any States which now permit declarant aliens to vote, I will thank the gentlemen from such States to correct me.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. It was formerly true in Kansas. A foreigner was allowed to vote when he had declared his intention to become a citizen, but that right is not allowed now. I understand it is allowed in a few other States.

Mr. BOX. I shall not attempt to contradict the statement that it is allowed in some States, but I think the statutes of such States have been amended so that that can not now be done. Certainly not more than one or two States allow it. I believe that none of them do.

Mr. SNELL. It ought not to be done anyway.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have made this pro forma motion for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill what, if anything, has been done with respect to making a larger appropriation for the conduct of the naturalization bureau in the city of New York? I have occasion repeatedly to call at that office in the interest of applicants for final papers toward citizenship, and I want to take this opportunity to say a word to the House in appreciation of the resident commissioner of immigration, Hon. Merton A. Sturgis, one of the most painstaking and hard-working officials in the service of the country. At one time, a year or two ago, his office was behind 25,000 cases. It was impossible to handle them for lack of help due to inadequate appropriation, perhaps by this committee, or due to the recommendation of the Director of the Budget. In this case we have a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. There are 25,000 applicants at that one office who are anxious to pay the United States the sum of \$4 each, a total of \$100,000, which we are unable to receive because of the shortage of office assistants. This committee will never receive any complaint of these conditions from Mr. Sturgis or any of his hard-working assistants, whose loyalty to the service induces them voluntarily to struggle against insuperable odds to make the office function. But I personally know the situation and it is my duty to bring to the attention of my colleagues of the House the real facts as I know them to exist in the New York Naturalization Bureau. Has the chairman and his committee considered a large appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. We have increased that appropriation by \$100,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That silences me. It is a wise and salutary as well as a business appropriation.

Mr. BOX. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if the State of New York permits declarants to vote before they become naturalized?

Mr. O'CONNELL. So far as I know, it does not permit it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For traveling expenses of officers, special agents, and other employees of the Children's Bureau; experts and temporary assistants, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$6 a day, and interpreters to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$4 a day when actually employed; purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and for reprints from State, city, and private publications for distribution when said reprints can be procured more cheaply than they can be printed by the Government, \$59,200: *Provided*, That appropriations herein made for the Children's Bureau shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings for the promotion of child welfare when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I rise to call your attention to the proviso at the end of the paragraph. Part of this appropriation is made available for officials of the Children's Bureau for expenses of attendance at meetings for the promotion of child welfare. A short time ago the director of the bureau appealed to Congress for an extension of the maternity and infancy act, asserting if the time was extended to July 1, 1929, the objective, that of stimulating the States to activity, would be accomplished.

As soon as Congress passed the law granting this extension officials of the bureau increased their activity to have the law reenacted. Speaking before women's clubs the officials picture a situation that arouses indignation among the uninformed because of the repeal of this act. It has been done in my city and I have received appeals from organizations immediately after the departure of the propagandists.

The last conference I had prior to my departure for Washington to attend the opening of this session was with a committee of ladies representing a league that is very active along this line. There were four ladies, as I recall, each a chairman of a separate committee. I was asked to support treaties when I had no voice in such matters, was questioned as to my attitude on foreign affairs, as to my views on the infancy and maternity act, and numerous other matters properly of interest to State legislatures, but having no place before the United States Congress.

I told the ladies of my views, which I had expressed time and again during the campaign. My opposition to all Federal-aid projects is pronounced. River and harbor improvement is a proper charge upon the Treasury of the United States, but the

many projects authorized by Congress, for agriculture and other activities, are simply to compel State legislatures to appropriate money if they desire to share in Federal aid, which is nothing more than taking money from the taxpayers by the Federal Government and sending it back to the States from which it is collected. In some instances, however, more money is taken from a State than is returned, because the larger or richer States provide funds for such activities in the smaller States.

Connecticut, Illinois, and Massachusetts have never availed themselves of Federal aid under the infancy and maternity act. The money collected from the tax payers of those States for this purpose has gone to others. If money from this appropriation is to be used to permit officials of the Children's Bureau to attend meetings the Secretary of Labor should not only scrutinize carefully every request but he should serve notice upon those connected with the bureau that in the future Government funds, and time that belongs to the Government, are not to be used for the purpose of inducing individuals and organizations to urge upon their members of Congress the advisability of enacting legislation that would enlarge the activities of this bureau. For 20 years the United States Bureau of Public Health has issued and distributed bulletins dealing with the care of infants and diseases of infants. The Children's Bureau issues pamphlets along the same line. Take the bulletin, *Infant Care*. The Children's Bureau has distributed millions of copies of this publication while the Bureau of Public Health continues to print and enlarge its bulletin *Care of the Baby*, which it has been distributing for over 20 years. Originally a four-page pamphlet, *Care of the Baby*, has grown to manhood and is now over 100 pages. *Infant Care* has likewise grown until now we find the revised issue contains 118 pages. I admit both are valuable publications, but I do not see the necessity of the Government issuing two bulletins at the taxpayers' expense upon the same subject. The Children's Bureau is a statistical-gathering bureau, work that properly belongs to the Census Bureau, and work that can be done more economically by the Census Bureau.

If we are to have an extra session of Congress let us hope that some attention will be paid to the necessity of repealing some of the hundreds of useless laws now upon the statute books, including the ones creating useless bureaus and commissions. Then, and not until then, will Government expenditures be reduced so as to enable a reduction of any moment in the taxes of the overburdened taxpayers of the country.

Under the infancy and maternity act \$50,000 of the million appropriated annually was used for administration purposes. The employees lose their positions July 1. The hearings show the bureau desires to retain them, for they requested \$50,000 to start a study of juvenile delinquency. I want to compliment the committee for declining to authorize the appropriation.

I am in favor of my State appropriating a sufficient amount, an amount the officials think is necessary to carry out the purposes of the maternity and infancy act and all other welfare measures, but I am opposed to the Federal Government exercising any supervision over this work. The people of Missouri and the legislature of my State are capable of handling all such matters without interference from the Federal Government. They are on the scene and know better than either the legislative or executive branch of the Federal Government what is necessary for the welfare of the men, women, and children of their community. You will find that our women and children will not be neglected.

I believe that all Federal-aid projects advocated solely for the purpose of stimulating the States to appropriate money should be repealed, and I will even go so far as to say that I am ready now to vote to set a date to discontinue Federal aid for roads, say, in 1933 or 1934. The States are entitled to notification in advance, and I think four or five years is sufficient. The policy of Federal aid is not sound and unless a great emergency exists can not, in my opinion, be defended.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I wish to say, in reply to what the gentleman from Missouri has said, that I do not think he will find very strong sentiment in the House to support any bill denying appropriations for good roads, nor will he find very sympathetic interest in the House to the denial of other appropriations to which the States are asked to contribute.

In so far as maternity legislation is concerned, that matter has been before the House a number of times. It was only contemplated by the original act that help should be extended for a few years, and it is interesting to note that 46 States accepted it and report excellent results therefrom. The law has been well administered by the bureau having it in charge, according to the information submitted to our committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that after the original law was passed it was learned that the legal definition of an infant was a boy or girl until it had reached its majority, and if you will go over the allocations of money made by this bureau to many States you will find that the money has not been spent on infants in some of the States, but that it has been used to take care of children in school, up to the age of 16 and 17 years, and it has also been spent in making all kinds of investigations affecting grown children. The money has not been spent all these years, as Congress intended, for the care of the mother and child at time of birth. I have the facts in my office if the gentleman desires to see them. As to the sentiment in Congress, it will change when the sentiment back home changes, as it has done here time and again, and when the people are properly informed on the subject of Federal aid he will see a change in sentiment both here and at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TILSON having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LEAVITT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHREVE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15089, the Interior Department appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 15089, the Interior Department appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman whether he has consulted with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], who is on the subcommittee?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have consulted with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is the ranking minority member, and my action is in accord with his wishes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Was an amendment placed on the bill by the Senate touching an irrigation project at El Paso?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is no such amendment in the bill. My information is that no amendment has been put in the bill affecting that matter. I know this, that no such amendment was put in the bill by the Senate committee. What action was taken on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I do not know.

What the gentleman has in mind is the Rio Grande reclamation project. The people there were disturbed because our committee reduced the cash appropriation for 1930, \$50,000, if I remember aright, and provided a larger reappropriation of unexpended construction funds from this year. Their informa-

tion was that there would not be available as large an amount of unexpended funds as we proposed to reappropriate. When it was pending in the House I made that statement. Request was made by the bureau officials in the field, and information has been received that the amount we proposed to reappropriate, \$125,000, will be available for this purpose; and this being true, the total that would be available for 1930 for operation and maintenance would be \$375,000, and, so far as I know, the situation is satisfactory to those who are interested.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In other words, the \$375,000 will be sufficient to carry on the project for the next fiscal year?

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand it, that is satisfactory to all concerned. It is the amount recommended by the Budget, but arranged a little differently, and now that they are assured that the \$125,000 will be available, I think that removes any objection.

Mr. WELCH of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH of California. Is there anything involved in the conference with reference to the city of San Francisco and the grant in Hetch Hetchy and Yosemite National Park?

Mr. CRAMTON. My information is that the only amendment affecting Yosemite at all is an amendment with reference to the appropriation for development of a water supply on Glacier Point. I am sure there is nothing involved in the conference with reference to the Hetch Hetchy controversy with San Francisco.

Since the gentleman from California has mentioned this subject, perhaps this would be as good a time as any for me to make a statement to the House about this general subject, which I discussed at some length at the last session of Congress, and in that discussion the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and the lady from California [Mrs. KAHN] also joined. I may say there were three matters then under discussion. As to two of them my information is that the controversy is on the way to an entirely satisfactory termination.

In the matter of roads, as I understand, although I have not definite and positive information, which the city of San Francisco was to build under the terms of the Raker Act, the city has manifested its purpose to comply with the requirements of the Interior Department.

In the matter of the administration of the park, the enforcement of proper sanitary arrangements, the city this season has manifested a willingness to leave such administration in the hands of the park authorities, where it belongs, and there appears to be no continuance of this controversy.

As to the third matter, the sale of power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. by the city of San Francisco, which I have contended is in conflict with the provisions of the Raker Act, where it is set forth that none of the power developed shall be sold to any person or corporation for resale, with certain drastic penalties provided in the act, I am not so well advised as to the situation.

Personally, I feel strongly that the explicit conditions of the Raker Act, which the city of San Francisco accepted, must be complied with by the city. I think, however, no one has any desire to require the impossible or to ask the city to throw away power while acquiring a proper distribution system. Personally, I would feel much more at ease about the situation if I were satisfied as to the good faith of the government of San Francisco in their efforts to acquire a proper distribution system. One thing the city could do to reassure those of us who have this feeling would be to do that which is in their power to do now, and that is to arrange to deliver to itself in San Francisco enough of this electricity to meet its own needs, instead of continuing as now to sell at a very low price to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and immediately buy back at a much higher price. As I understand, the proper connections could be made so that it would use this amount of electricity itself at a fairly small cost. If it would do this and then proceed as rapidly as conditions permit to acquire a sufficient distribution system—and this does not mean they have to buy all the power companies of San Francisco and vicinity and thereby possibly make the proposition so big they can not carry it through—the power situation would look much different to Congress. But at present it carries potentialities of serious complications.

I am pleased to make this statement in connection with my answer to the question of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

SENATE BILL 1710 TO CREATE A HYDRAULIC LABORATORY IN THE BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill S. 1710, a bill of Senator RANSDELL's, and to publish a letter from the engineering council on the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the reports of our Army engineers on river and harbor projects are generally believed to be expressed in technical terms and a phraseology as puzzling to the average layman as the hieroglyphics or cuneiform inscriptions on a Babylonian brick. And a discussion by engineers, both civilian and Army, of a bill, the purpose of which is to create a hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards, would prove about as attractive to the ordinary American, who roots for the home baseball team and yells for his favorite prize fighter, as a visit to the Smithsonian Institute or being a member of a coroner's jury. In other words, engineering subjects are left by an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans, male and female, to the solemn-looking folk who believe they are pundits, and, perhaps, maybe they are correct in this assumption.

If a person believes he is a member of the sublimated Esoterics, encourage him and assure him that there is a land fairer than this, is the attitude of the twice-a-week movie man American, and I am one of them and strong for the bloc. But every now and then even the highest priests of every profession will fling temporarily into the discard learned jargon and terrible, exhausting efforts to look superior and will talk our language and go after one another in such a fashion and gusto as to excite the plaudits of the "bleachers."

But, seriously, the discussion of Senate bill 1710, introduced by Senator JOSEPH E. RANSDELL, and which passed the Senate without opposition, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, by the foremost engineers of the United States was undoubtedly one of the most interesting legislative controversies I ever had the good fortune to hear and words used could be easily understood by the unpretentious toiler who wears a blue jumper or overall and a woolen hat.

The claims made by the civilian engineers of the wonderful results that would flow from the creation and establishment in the Bureau of Standards of a hydraulic laboratory took on a coloring that gave the subject a romantic aspect and hue, while the recital by Gen. Edgar Jadwin of the accomplishments and the triumphs of the Army Engineers here and "over there," who were content to go unnoticed, unheralded, and in many cases unknelt, was sufficiently inspiring to make a fellow look at the flag and shout "Hurrah for the Engineers!"

Senate 1710 has not been reported out by the committee. It looks like it may not be reported out and it looks like the rivers and harbors bill reported out at the last session will not be considered by the House, in view of the attitude of the President, because be it remembered that when the President sneezes most Republicans get the flu. The rivers and harbors bill carries a provision which some fellows who are in danger of blowing the gas out, say is analogous to the proposed S. 1710, the Ransdell bill.

Therefore, the letter which I give below may look like a post-mortem or, what is worse, a postprandial address. But who can tell? It may galvanize the corpse and stimulate and motivate and actuate the Rivers and Harbors Committee into reporting out a bill, the proponents of which claim would do more for the inventive genius of America than has been done legislatively since the formation of the Union by providing a channel in which the spirit, the divine afflatus of invention could move unobstructed, unhindered, and unlock the gates of what is still mystery:

AMERICAN ENGINEERING COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1928.

Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: American Engineering Council is an organization, the membership of which is made up of 24 engineering and allied technical professions of the United States, which organizations have a combined membership of approximately 43,000 professional engineers. Council functions for the purpose of expressing the views of the engineering profession in regard to national questions of an engineering character.

In keeping with the objects and purposes of American Engineering Council, it has supported ever since its inception the idea of the establishment in the Bureau of Standards of a national hydraulic research laboratory such as embodied in Senate bill 1710. Last April, representatives of American Engineering Council, in conjunction with

eminent hydraulic engineers from many parts of the United States, appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and submitted testimony showing the desirability and need for establishing a national hydraulic research laboratory under the Bureau of Standards.

Subsequent to these hearings, your committee has taken no action concerning Senate bill 1710. It has, however, in H. R. 14066, section 7, incorporated a provision authorizing the establishment of a hydraulic laboratory under the direction of the War Department.

May we respectfully state that this provision does not satisfy the need for a national hydraulic research laboratory nor the wishes of those most interested and concerned.

We have the following thought regarding the entire matter:

1. Section 7, H. R. 14066, authorizes the Chief of Engineers to carry on work which he now has sufficient authority to do. In fact, he is now engaged in such work. He has recently employed Prof. W. B. Gregory, Tulane University, New Orleans, to conduct researches on models in connection with the Bonnet Carré spillway near New Orleans.

2. A national hydraulic-research laboratory is needed not only for the purpose of conducting experiments for river and harbor projects but also for the purpose of conducting scientific hydraulic experiments for any citizen who submits a plausible problem and is willing to pay for the work involved in conducting the experiments.

3. Such a laboratory is also needed for the purpose of aiding in the solution of hydraulic problems of such Federal agencies as the Geological Survey, Federal Power Commission, Reclamation Service, and others.

4. The hydraulic laboratory should be under the direction and control of the Bureau of Standards, because through the years it has developed a scientific attitude and technique requisite for the handling of such projects as may be undertaken in such a laboratory. Furthermore, it has on its staff men trained in the several sciences, knowledge of which would be required of the staff of such a laboratory if it is to function with the greatest efficiency and effectiveness.

5. We direct your attention to the testimony of President-elect Hoover as it appears on pages 36-37 of the hearings wherein he gave 10 excellent reasons why this laboratory should be in the Bureau of Standards.

6. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has reported that the bill, S. 1710, is not in conflict with the President's financial policy.

7. The bill has been passed by the Senate.

We do not desire to take from the Corps of Engineers any authority to conduct whatever researches it may deem necessary in prosecuting its work of flood control. However, for the reasons set forth by our representatives at the hearings and in view of the facts herein stated, we earnestly and respectfully request that you recognize the widespread and pronounced sentiment in favor of this bill by favorably reporting it to the House of Representatives at an early date. We wish to assure you that the action requested will be greatly appreciated by all those thoroughly conversant with and earnestly concerned with the development of the hydraulic science and practice of the Nation. It is an important matter, because without its proper development the Nation will not realize to the fullest degree the potential value of its hydraulic possessions.

Respectfully yours,

L. W. WALLACE, *Executive Secretary.*

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed and include a statement made by myself before the subcommittee having in charge the hearings on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is undoubtedly true that the splendid service rendered to the American people during the past eight years by the Department of Commerce largely contributed to the nomination and election of Herbert Hoover as President of the United States. One of the most important arms or divisions of the Department of Commerce is that of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, operating under the supervision and direction of one of the ablest men in public life to-day, Dr. Julius Klein. This bureau is performing for the American manufacturer, farmer, and business man a service of the most invaluable character. As a Member of Congress, and also as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, it has been my pleasure to cooperate in every way possible with the Department of Commerce in general, and with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in particular, touching the work of the department and the bureau. I have seen the work of this bureau grow from year to year, and the extent of its effective usefulness increase many fold.

Two or three years ago I aided in securing the establishment of some additional branch offices of this bureau, one of which was located in Louisville, within my congressional district. During the present session I also joined in an effort to secure

further extension of the work of this bureau, and to that end on December 8, 1928, appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, conducting hearings on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1930, and made a statement in behalf of such further extension, and included therewith some data concerning the work of the Louisville office of the bureau. The Louisville office is performing a very fine service in the Kentucky and southern Indiana region, and is considered one of the most progressive and efficient branch offices of the entire bureau service.

Under the leave granted me therefor, I include as a part of these remarks the statement made by me before the subcommittee referred to. It is as follows:

SATURDAY, December 8, 1928.

EXTENSION OF ACTIVITIES OF DISTRICT OFFICES, BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

STATEMENT OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. SHREVE. We shall be pleased to hear you, Mr. THATCHER.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hesitate, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to suggest any increase of any item of appropriation. I know your problems. I do not know what your Budget totals are and what you have to consider, but I do believe that this branch of the Government's work is one of greatest value to the country.

Two or three years ago, when I came before this subcommittee in conjunction with some other Members to secure the establishment of some additional branch offices, the subcommittee was very kind and granted the appropriation, after we had gotten the Budget to make a supplemental estimate, after further consideration by the Budget, and by the President himself, as a matter of fact.

So far as I know, those offices have functioned very efficiently. I know that one of those offices has been located in my own city of Louisville, and the increased trade done by the merchants and the manufacturers in the Louisville region is running about \$400,000 a year, and now, during the current fiscal year, it probably will run over \$500,000.

There is need for some expansion there, and I take it that there is the like reason for the request on behalf of some of the other offices in the country.

My understanding from the Department of Commerce is that after the establishment of about 8 or 10 more branch offices in the country at large, they will have, perhaps, a sufficient number of branch offices, and that thereafter the work in this line should be restricted generally to the matter of expansion.

Of course, the offices that have already been established are rendering efficient service. A number of them, at least, need help. They have to grow, and unless they are allowed some legitimate expansion, it means that the demands will be very insistent for the establishment of other offices, and it will be really much cheaper to expand these offices which are strategically located, where they will serve the various sections in the best possible way. It would be better to give them a reasonable expansion than to assume the overhead of new offices.

I am speaking generally for the entire service. I feel that if a reasonable increase could be made in this item, with the discretion vested in the Department of Commerce to allocate or to distribute the amount in such a way as to serve the purpose of trade in the best possible manner, this would be the wise way to handle it.

I know that, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department, I was very glad to vote the other day with Mr. BACON, also a member of that subcommittee—who is here with me to-day—and all of the subcommittee members, in fact, for the full amount of appropriations asked by the Budget for the Post Office Department for the extension of these air mail routes to Latin America.

One of the objects of the extension of the air mail service to Latin America is to increase our trade there, and help our trade relations in that portion of the world.

To foster our trade relations effectively we must have these branch offices functioning in the most efficient manner possible.

It was brought out in those subcommittee hearings that Germany is trying to establish all through Latin America—Central and South America—air mail routes. France is putting on an air line from the West Coast of Africa to Brazil, and is anxious to extend its air mail service through South America. Of course, we have to meet that situation. The trade of Latin America in the future must depend largely upon, or be determined by, air-mail contracts; but these contracts will not be of themselves sufficient—so far as we are concerned—unless we are able to supply our merchants and our manufacturers with first-hand definite information, so that they may avail themselves of the business conditions in these countries, and in that way enable them to get that trade.

It seems to me, therefore, gentlemen, that there is a real vital need for an increase in this item; \$19,000, I believe, is what has been sug-

gested in the Budget figure. That does not seem to me at all to be adequate. I do not see how it will allow any expansion that amounts to anything.

I think that the service these branch offices are rendering—most of them, at least—is of such a character as fully to justify favorable consideration by this committee of this branch of the work.

Take the Panama Canal; that is a great agency of our Government. It gives us a contact with Latin America that nothing else could give. We should fully utilize it. The canal, the establishment of these air mail routes, and the visit of the President elect to Latin America—which, while primarily one of good will, carries in its train the incidental consideration of trade development—these are the things that are going to help us. The trade with Latin America must in large measure constitute the foreign trade of our country in the future. It is a great, undeveloped country, and I believe that through the agency of these branch offices we can get more for the amount of money invested than, perhaps, through any other agency of the Government.

With the permission of your committee, I should like to include a short statement of the business of the Louisville office, as typical of the other offices.

If you can see your way clear to make it, I believe that there should be a substantial increase in this item for this purpose. The sum of \$100,000 has been suggested as an appropriate amount for this purpose.

The statement above referred to is as follows:

LOUISVILLE DISTRICT OFFICE

The number of current clients of this office during the fiscal year 1927-28 was 330.

In 1926-27, 11 firms reported voluntarily that sales made and savings effected through the services of the district office totaled \$87,960, or an average of \$7,995 per firm. In 1927-28, 35 firms reported a total of \$392,626, or an average of \$11,217 per firm. Both years a large number of firms reported that it was not possible to give a dollars-and-cents statement on the business resulting through the office, but stated that definite benefits had been obtained. During the current fiscal year the increased business through the Louisville office should run over a half million dollars.

Services rendered: 1926-27, 34,794; 1927-28, 39,583; increase, 14 per cent.

Services rendered consist of outgoing letters, inquiries made by visitors and telephone calls, and the furnishing of trade opportunities, trade lists, and bureau reports.

In order to continue the same high-grade service of previous years the daily overtime of the five employees totaled 13¼ days during the fiscal year 1927-28. The personnel of this office consists of a manager, an assistant manager, two clerks, and a messenger.

There is urgent need for additional personnel in order that the amount of overtime be reduced and at the same time the service to exporters be improved. Additional office equipment, such as filing cabinets and bookcases, are needed, so that with proper and convenient filing, furnishing of requested information may be expedited.

Increased travel funds are needed. It has been learned through experience that the exporter is best served through personal contact with the district office, and for this reason the manager should have sufficient travel funds, so that he may personally cover his territory at least once a year. Under present conditions this is impossible.

Louisville is one of the great industrial centers of the South. With nine trunk railroads and all-year river transportation, it is a natural distributing center. The leading industry is tobacco. Exports of tobacco from Kentucky in 1927 totaled \$11,816,000. Louisville is the greatest manufacturing city in the United States south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers and is rapidly growing in wealth and population.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JACOBSTEIN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred, as follows:

S. 4461. An act to provide for the policing of military roads leading out of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 21, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, December 21, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

First deficiency appropriation bill.
Independent offices appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Requesting the President to propose the calling of an international conference for the simplification of the calendar, or to accept, on behalf of the United States, an invitation to participate in such a conference (H. J. Res. 334).

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

For the relief of J. F. McMurray (H. R. 10741).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

706. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1929, amounting to \$30,000 (H. Doc. No. 488), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13507. A bill to amend section 3 of Public Act No. 230 (37 Stat. L. p. 194); without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 14761. A bill for the relief of Clarence Stevens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 14981. A bill for the relief of Josephine Laforge (Sage Woman); with amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 15621) to regulate interstate commerce by motor vehicles operating as common carriers of persons on the public highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 15622) to provide for the erection of a public building at New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 15623) providing for the erection of a summer White House in the Black Hills, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 15624) to restore Fort Negley, at Nashville, which was used and occupied by Federal forces during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIG: A bill (H. R. 15625) to amend the act of May 24, 1928, entitled "An act making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15626) to provide compensation for members of the civilian military training camps who are injured in line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 275) to provide for the services of an assistant shipping clerk in the Door-keeper's department; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 276) to provide \$200 per month for additional clerical assistance to the Committee on Accounts; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 277) to provide for the services of an additional assistant clerk to the Committee on Accounts; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 15627) for the relief of Mary Frances McConnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15628) granting a distinguished service cross to James C. Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 15629) granting a pension to Sarah E. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15630) granting a pension to Minnie V. Stahl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15631) for the relief of William Dean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 15632) granting a pension to Francis F. Beale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 15633) granting a pension to Fannie Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 15634) granting an increase of pension to Mattie M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15635) for the relief of George A. Hormel & Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 15636) granting a pension to Harriett Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 15637) granting a pension to Elizabeth Taylor Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15638) granting a pension to Maywood Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15639) granting a pension to Alban D. Philson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15640) granting a pension to Mary Lukemiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 15641) to correct the military record of Vernon S. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 15642) for the relief of Matthew Edward Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15643) for the relief of Mary A. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15644) granting a pension to Carola M. Tonry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 15645) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 15646) granting an increase of pension to Elvira L. Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 15647) granting a pension to Nancy Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15648) granting a pension to Hiram M. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 15649) granting a pension to Ellen E. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15650) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Woodbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 15651) for the relief of Leonidas L. Cochran; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8075. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Admiral Glass Camp, No. 36, United Spanish War Veterans, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring additional hospital facilities at the Soldiers' Home, Pacific Branch, Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8076. By Mr. CULLEN: Preamble and resolutions unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, at meeting held on December 12, 1928, stating that theft and pilferage of merchandise prevails to an alarming extent on the piers and generally in the harbor of New York, and serious and needless losses are thereby sustained, and that Congress should adopt such amendments to the laws as it may be found necessary to make through which to clothe our courts with power adequately to punish all parties found guilty of the charge of theft and pilferage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8077. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of J. G. Puterbaugh, president of the McAlester Fuel Co., McAlester, Okla., urging support of the Pittman-Newton recapture bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8078. Also, petition of J. S. Flautt, secretary and sales manager of the Majestic Milling Co., Aurora Mo., indorsing House bill 15267, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8079. Also, petition of W. R. Franklin, McLoud, Okla., member of the executive counsel of the Oklahoma Pharmaceutical Association, urging support of the Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8080. Also, petition of National Wheat Pool Committee, representing States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Indiana, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, urging passage of Senate bill 4602; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8081. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of the Bar Association of the State of New Mexico, indorsing House bill 13567, dividing the eighth judicial circuit and creating a new circuit to be designated as the tenth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8082. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition from members of the faculty and student body of the Superior State Teachers' College, at Superior, Wis., protesting against the proposed appropriation of \$289,000,000 for 15 cruisers for the Navy, as suggested by the President; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8083. Also, petition by the members of district No. 4 of the Wisconsin Cooperative Creamery Association, petitioning that the tariff on casein be at least 5 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, December 21, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who dost fill us with yearnings of an infinite desire, with longings insatiable, with groanings that can not be uttered, abide with us this day as a Silence behind the voices of the world, as the Truth within its illusions. Purify our vision, that we may know as we are known; increase our faith, that we may lean wholly on Thee. May the spirit of duty and service ennoble all our work, and do Thou lift us far above the tyranny of detail into the larger freedom and fuller life of discovery which Thou hast revealed in Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Mr. JONES. I ask that the appropriation bill just messaged from the House be laid before the Senate and referred.

The bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say with reference to the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor appropriation bill that I have called a meeting of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for half past 1 this afternoon. I have taken the matter up with the various department representatives. There will be only two or three small amendments to propose to the bill; so I hope to have the full committee act on the bill this afternoon in order that we may report it at once, that it may be called up to-morrow for consideration.